





ISAAC FOOT

m. h.

10/1

7

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

CLASSICAL GREEK LITERATURE

VOL. I.—PART I.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

A HISTORY
OF
CLASSICAL GREEK LITERATURE

BY THE
REV. J. P. MAHAFFY, M.A.

KNIGHT OF THE ORDER OF THE REDEEMER
FELLOW AND PROF. OF ANCIENT HISTORY, TRIN. COLL. DUBLIN
HON. FELLOW OF QUEEN'S COLL. OXFORD
AUTHOR OF 'SOCIAL LIFE IN GREECE' 'GREEK LIFE AND THOUGHT'
'THE GREEK WORLD UNDER ROMAN SWAY' ETC.

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I. PART I.

THE POETS

WITH AN APPENDIX ON HOMER BY PROF. SAYCE

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED

London
MACMILLAN AND CO.

AND NEW YORK

1891

All rights reserved

Ἄλλὰ γὰρ οὐκ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις χρὴ τοῦτοις τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων
ζητεῖν τὰς καινότητας, ἐν οἷς οὔτε παράδοξον οὔτ' ἄπιστον οὔτ'
ἐξω τῶν νομιζομένων οὐδὲν ἔξεστιν εἰπεῖν, ἀλλ' ἡγεῖσθαι τοῦτον
χαριέστατον, ὃς ἂν τῶν διεσπαρμένων ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἄλλων διανοαῖς
ἀθροῖσαι τὰ πλεῖστα δυνηθῇ καὶ φράσαι κάλλιστα περὶ αὐτῶν.

ISOCRATES.

PREFACE

TO

THE FIRST VOLUME.

(THIRD EDITION.)

IT is the author's first duty, in committing this remodelled third edition to the public, to thank those kindly and sympathetic critics who have not only encouraged him by general approbation, but sought to improve the book by many corrections and suggestions. Similar obligations are also due even to the most adverse reviewers, who, while they have said many unjust things, have generally been able to lay their fingers on some real blot. Wherever manifest mistakes were thus pointed out, whether from good will or the reverse, they have been corrected. Many notes are added, indicating materials which have since accrued for the study of particular authors, and which could not conveniently be embodied in the text. But it is well to say a word here on points which are still maintained against the critics, if it were only to show respect to the strictures of learned men which are not here adopted.

An incautious reader of reviews might have imagined this book to be the work of a paradoxical person, who despised the existing lights, and set up his own, often crude, opinions against all authority. Nothing could be further from the truth. It was rather from a wide and laborious survey of the recent literature in this field, that opinions were gathered and set down without any pretence to originality, which appeared new to those who had never searched for them. Unlike the lot of other authors in the same field, who fret over their unrecognised or refuted

claims to originality, it was my fortune to have far too much ascribed to me, when I was really selecting from and supporting what the learning or the acuteness of others had discovered.

The reason of this is not far to seek. While it is an usual fashion among authors to affect the modesty of concealing their personal opinions—a fashion very convenient for those who have no personal opinions, or who are afraid to state them—it is surely far more honest, and more modest too, that in disputed questions a man should label the opinion he adopts, not as an universal truth, but as that which he himself has preferred. Thus, when a critic stated that I had been ‘unfair to Pindar,’ this is itself unfair in the face of the statement (p. 250), ‘I am bound to say that they (the critics) show a general agreement against the view I have taken of the poet’s position in his age.’ What more could be expected than that an author should warn his readers not to accept what he said as more than an individual conviction? This personal element in a book has surely its value as well as its weakness.

Passing to more definite criticisms, it may be observed, in answer to those who complained of the omission of Plutarch¹ and Lucian, while Apollonius Rhodius and Babrius were included, that a History of Greek Classical Literature was promised, and nothing more. If, therefore, any classical author had been omitted, it would be a decided defect. But if a few poetical authors outside that category were added, the reader only got more than his bargain, and had no reason to grumble. The principle on which these few authors were added was this: that they are read for their form’s sake, and are so far classical.

So also the division into poets and prose writers, one now general in Germany, was adopted not merely for its intrinsic value, but to enable each volume to stand alone, and to be sold separately. The few repetitions complained of were for this reason unavoidable, and appear, moreover, to have been of special service to those who desired to find faults.

This last advantage also belongs to the spelling of Greek

¹ I have since treated Plutarch at length in my *Greek World under Roman Sway*, chaps. xiii., xiv.

proper names, in which everyone attempts some compromise, and no one satisfies his neighbour. Censures on this head are therefore of little importance, unless the method censured is one that produces ambiguity and confusion. And now at last we see our way to a settlement of this vexed question, by means of the reformed pronunciation of Latin. It is hardly possible that the English schools will keep up the old absurdities of Greek pronunciation ; but even if they do, our obvious course is to print our Greek names in Latin orthography, and tell our readers to pronounce them as they ought to pronounce Latin. Thus we shall banish from our classical books such monstrous forms as *Aischulos*, *Lukourgos*, &c., which represent no known utterance, and have no earthly claim to respect or endurance. Had the reform in Latin pronunciation been generally adopted, I should now have gone back to the Latin orthography of Greek names. In a few years let us hope that no other course will even seem tolerable.

It is worth recording as a curious fact, that there is hardly a chapter, or indeed a general feature in these volumes, which has not been by some praised as their strongest, by others censured as their weakest, point. This applies, for example, to the bibliographical notes, which the special student of any one author often found defective, while the general student, who sought starting points only, found them of great assistance. Of course they could not be, and were not meant to be, complete. They only professed to give the reader some idea of what amount of special literature he would find illustrating each great Greek writer, and those works were specially selected which would at once give him fuller information when he turned to them. Much additional matter of this kind has been added ; but even now the critics may possibly find, in more than one instance, the omission of the name of some learned editor, whose repute, like some very loud voices, has not reached so far as might be judged from the noise close around them.

The student who desires general directions is referred (as was done in my former edition) to Müller and Donaldson's 'Greek Literature' (ed. Heitz in German), a work of genius on Müller's part, of vast erudition on Donaldson's. There are

also easily accessible, in French, E. Bournouf's book ; in German, Munk's and Nicolai's, the latter particularly useful for its bibliography. Recently we have the works of Sittl (Munich, 1887) and of M. and A. Croiset (the first two vols. Paris, 1890), both learned and able histories. The larger and deeper books are partial or unfinished : Bernhardt's and Bergk's Histories, the former on all the poets, the latter incomplete (edited by Hinrichs and Peppmüller in 4 vols. from the author's MSS. and brief sketches) ; Patin on the Greek tragedians and Meineke on the comedians, Klein (*Gesch. des Dramas*) on both. Since my first edition appeared, the Fragments of Comedy have been splendidly re-edited by Th. Kock. I speak of the principal authorities on Greek prose authors in the Preface to the Second Volume.

From all these I have borrowed freely, and far more than can possibly appear from special acknowledgments. There must be added those numerous and invaluable periodicals in which the Germans and French prosecute philological discovery: the Transactions and Proceedings of the many Academies—Berlin, Leipzig, Munich, Göttingen, Vienna, &c.; the *Philologus*, *Neue Jahrbücher*, *Hermes*, *Bursian's Jahresbericht*, the *Rhein. Museum*, the *Revue Critique*, *Journal des Savants*, &c., &c., as well as the many Programs, with which the press of Germany teems. For it is not enough nowadays to know the texts thoroughly, or even the standard commentaries. The historian must take account of the theories of many specialists, who publish them in monographs, or in scattered articles throughout various journals. Those only who have attempted to put together and systematise such materials will make due allowance for the mistakes and the inconsistencies, sometimes real, which cannot but creep into so vast a scheme. The existence of such defects is merely human, and should be condoned. It is only their number and quality which can make them the object of fair censure. To delay the publication of any large work until all possible flaws are removed, is to postpone it, if not indefinitely, at least till some remote period, and to sacrifice any freshness or vigour it possesses for no certain equivalent.

Homeric Literature in England has recently been enriched by Mr. Leaf's *Iliad*, Mr. D. B. Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, his article *Homer* in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and by a controversy with Mr. Sayce in the *Journal of Philology*. As regards the careful review in the *Homer* there is nothing special to remark, save that the author has regarded Nutzhorn's book as of greater authority than it commands among other Homeric critics. This is specially the case in the criticism of the legends about the Peisistratic Commission, which he is disposed to reject, as having no basis in fact. But on all critical questions Mr. Monro expresses himself with an amount of caution which precludes decided views. In his controversy with Mr. Sayce he adopts the more conservative view of the antiquity of the poems, even in language, whereas Mr. Sayce is tending more and more to become a disciple of Mr. Paley, and to assert the Periclean age as that in which *our* Homer assumed its present form. Mr. Paley also added another tract to his many declarations on the subject, in which he has unwittingly classed me among the old conservatives, whereas the view deliberately preferred in this book is that which attributes a moderate antiquity to the completed poems. But I still think the eighth century B.C. nearer the mark than the fifth, though the traces of an Attic recension are very deep and often startling.

The decisions of recent German criticism have been distinctly in Mr. Sayce's direction, though I am glad to see that Aug. Fick, in his remarkable transcription of the *Iliad* into its supposed older or Æolic form, while holding the present text to be a *Mischmasch*, does not place the recasting of it later than 700 B.C., so far agreeing with me. I must, however, add that recently, on the strength of his new theory concerning the lyric poets, which the reader will find explained in its place, he brings down the change to 540-04 B.C.

As regards the bibliography of both Æschylus and Sophocles, general editions are so much more common, if we except the *Agamemnon*, than special commentaries on single plays, that the list is placed at the conclusion of the chapters. The larger compass of Euripides has made editions of single plays, in his case, the general rule, and accordingly the best editions

are specified under each play. This will account for an apparent inconsistency, which may thus be fairly vindicated.

Many corrections have been introduced into the account of the Comic Fragments from the work of Theodor Kock, as well as from some valuable private communications, for which I here return him my sincere thanks. This edition has received similar help from that of Prof. Lewis Campbell as regards the MSS. of Sophocles, and in many places my own studies have taught me to modify or emend what was amiss. August Fick's important labours on early Greek poetry are also introduced to the English reader, as well the recent German and French histories of Greek Literature. On the other hand several allusions to controversies since laid asleep have been struck out. For the convenience of students, both volumes have been divided into parts, which can be obtained separately, and which will thus save many readers the expense of buying the whole book, especially when they only seek information upon a particular branch of the subject.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN :

July, 1891.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

EPIC AND LYRIC POETRY.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	I
II. THE TRACES OF POETRY BEFORE HOMER	8
III. THE HOMERIC POEMS.—HISTORY OF THEIR TRANSMISSION FROM THE EARLIEST DAYS.—EDITIONS, SCHOLIA, ETC.	22
IV. HISTORY OF THE HOMERIC CONTROVERSY FROM THE REVIVAL OF LEARNING TO THE PRESENT DAY	46
V. GENERAL REMARKS UPON THE ORIGIN AND THE CHARACTER OF THE HOMERIC POEMS	77
VI. THE CYCLIC POETS AND THE BATRACHO-MYO-MACHIA.—ÆSOP AND BABRIUS	101
VII. THE DIDACTIC EPOS. HESIOD — THE EARLY PHILOSOPHERS	112
VIII. THE HOMERIC HYMNS AND TRIFLES	145
IX. THE LATER HISTORY OF EPIC POETRY	160
X. THE RISE OF PERSONAL POETRY AMONG THE GREEKS	171
XI. THE PROGRESS OF PERSONAL POETRY	206
XII. THE PUBLIC LYRIC POETRY OF THE GREEKS	221
XIII. THE AGE OF SIMONIDES AND PINDAR	229
APPENDIX ON THE LANGUAGE OF THE HOMERIC POEMS	255



HISTORY OF GREEK LITERATURE.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. It has been the usual practice with historians of Greek Literature to begin with a survey of the character and genius of the race, the peculiar features of the language, and the action which physical circumstances have produced upon the development of all these things. In the case of many German books these discussions are so long and so vague that the student is wearied before he arrives at a single fact in literature. It is furthermore necessary for the proper understanding of generalities that the reader should be intimate with the details which are postponed to a later part of the book. This appears to me so unpractical a method that I have abandoned it, and will not attempt any broad survey of the subject in a work devoted to the discussion of details, except in immediate connection with these details. In the present day, when so much is taught, and talked, and read about Greek history and art and poetry, the readers of such a book as this cannot but have enough acquaintance with the subject to permit them to dispense with any general introduction.

§ 2. When we come to inquire what were the earliest products of Greek Literature, we turn of course to Greek poetry,

for it is a well-known law of human progress, that long before the discovery or use of writing, and long before men care to read or hear simple prose statements, they delight in rythmical song, which strikes their imagination with greater force, and is more easily retained in their memory. This may be seen among us in the education of children, who pass in a few years through successive stages not unlike those of humanity at large in its progress from mental infancy to mature thought. We know that little children can be taught to repeat and remember rimes long before they will listen to the simplest story in prose. We must therefore expect to find the earliest efforts among the Greeks in their poetry. This is of course the case, and the poems of Homer and Hesiod are manifestly older, even as they stand, than any other books the Greeks have left us. For though we should concede to certain modern sceptics that the arrangement, or bringing into large unities, of these poems was not completed till pretty late in their history—even this extreme theory must admit and require that the *materials* of the poems, the short lays from which they were put together, are older than any other species of Greek literature. It must also be admitted that the number and extent of these shorter poems, which may have been worked into what we call Homer, was very considerable, and that only a very small portion of this literature has been transmitted to us.

When, therefore, we go back as far as we can, in our search for the earliest specimens of Greek poetry, we find ourselves in the presence of a very large body of what is called Epic poetry, all of which in early days passed under the name of Homer. The noblest and best of this poetry is in the opinion of all critics, ancient and modern, the *Iliad*; a poem of great length, of a definite plan and purpose, and composed with a perfect mastery both of style and language. The characters are pretty consistently drawn, and our general impression of the whole work suggests (*a*) that its author was one master hand, using both the legends of his people, and his own studies in human nature, to produce a dramatic picture not since surpassed or perhaps equalled. If this be so, we may safely assert, that

such a piece of work cannot be the first hesitating attempt of any people, however gifted, at literary composition.

But throughout the various shorter episodes of which the *Iliad* may be composed, there is such a harmony in the drawing of the various heroes who appear on the scene, that (*b*) even if one great master did not sketch them all, there must have been recognised types, which had long since assumed a definite and fixed shape for a school or series of poets, each of whom was able to express this type with adequate consistency. Either theory implies long and gradual preparation, many lesser attempts that have failed, and many faulty pictures which have disappeared, because they departed from the once fixed and recognised features of known characters.

§ 3. The ambitious and elaborate structure of these epics will clearly appear when we come to discuss them more fully in detail. It is here sufficient to insist that such compositions can in no wise represent the first attempts of the nation to frame a literature. In all the other fine arts, which the Greeks cultivated with equal success, they began with rude and even childish efforts, which possessed no beauty, and were evidently the work of artists who had as yet obtained but little control over the material upon which they wrought. We have still remaining archaic specimens of architecture, and of sculpture which strike us as almost ludicrous; nor do the various accounts of early painting and music handed down to us leave a shadow of doubt that these arts went through a similarly gradual development. The use of harmony in music was a late discovery, after many generations had been content with an accompaniment played note for note with the voice. The laws of perspective were not made out and introduced into painting until the exigencies of theatrical scene-painting had reacted upon the higher branches of the art. Thus everywhere in the history of Greek culture we find the same rude beginnings and gradual growth in grace and power. It is only a false and random metaphor when older critics speak of epic poetry springing like *Athene* full grown and in panoply from the brain of a single *Homer*.

§ 4. But if the *Iliad* is far too great and too perfect for a first attempt in literature, its vast superiority over what went before is, on the other hand, the main cause of our being so badly informed about earlier and ruder efforts. When any people are feeling their way in art, it is but natural that the first work of real genius should eclipse and supersede all its rivals, so as to become the model for succeeding ages. The great popularity and thorough nationality of Homer not only made him supplant earlier epics, but even made epic poetry supplant the earlier and simpler forms of poetry which had existed among the people; and so for some generations in Greek literature we hear of nothing but epic poets, hexameter verse, and legendary subjects.

§ 5. Yet there can be little doubt that the earliest forms of song among the Greeks, as among all other people, were not epic but lyric. The very *Linus* song mentioned by Homer, and the choral dances accompanied by singing, as well as the vintage songs, and other such national poetry—all these were distinctly of a lyric character. There is no reason to believe that these, though eclipsed by the splendour of epic poetry, ever ceased to exist, and we must rather conceive that the feelings of the common people satisfied themselves in these songs, while the nobles sat in state at their feasts, and even paid a bard to compose and recite the praise of gods and men. But it was not till this more artificial and elaborate school had worked itself out along with the society which produced and fostered it, it was not till the old aristocracies and kingdoms had broken down, and the epic poets became shallow and pedantic, that the lyric instincts began to assert themselves in literature. Then it was that great men went back to the people, who alone can originate a really fresh and lasting current in poetry, and borrowed from them the various forms of iambic, elegiac, and lyric proper which form the so-called lyric age of poetry in Greece.

It is a great and general mistake to set down this lyric poetry as the invention or product of a later age; it is merely the revival, and the drawing from obscurity, of the oldest form of Greek national song, modified and varied no doubt by

literary genius, but with its root deep-set in the hearts of the people.

When in process of time this lyric poetry became in its turn frigid and over-wrought, when it passed into the pay of despots or Olympic victors, and the people felt the want of some more national literature, the great poets of Athens again went back to the people. They adopted from the rude merry-makings of Dionysus and the boisterous vintage-feasts the popular elements of dramatic poetry, which when ennobled by the heritage of epic and lyric forms took its place as the last and perhaps the greatest branch in the rich growth of Greek national life. For from this day onward, and with a reading public, national effacement and decay, political ruin, social decadence made particularism and not nationalism the feature of Greek poetry. Yet even when the centre of gravity of Greek culture had passed from Hellas to the East, Theocritus and his school found in Sicilian pastoral life a pure vein of gold, which has made his bucolics, written among the bookworms and the sandhills of Egypt, an independent and fresh development in Greek Literature. These songs had existed in the uplands of Sicily, as we know, for centuries. They had attracted the genius of the great Stesichorus, who had treated some of their pastoral stories with his elaborate art. But the day of bucolic poetry had not come, or rather the great lyric outburst was just then carrying with it all the higher spirits of the nation; and so the attempt of Stesichorus, though known and approved, did not find any followers.

§ 6. This brief sketch of the periods of Greek poetry is drawn here only so far as to make it appear that all the so-called new kinds of verse, all the revolutions in taste which are so definite and plainly dated in Greek literary history, were simply reversions to the only true and pure source of inspiration in old days—the untutored songs of the people.¹ It is in the

¹ This reasonable theory, based on the nature of things, and supported by good scholars, such as Theodor Bergk, is rejected by Bernhardt (*Hist. Lit.* vol. ii. pp. 576, 589, 602) merely because he thinks our positive evidence for it insufficient. Niese agrees with him (*Hom. poesie*, excurs. i.). Sittl sides with me (*Lit. gesch.* i. cap. 1).

nature of any cultivated school of poetry to grow gradually more laboured and artificial, until at last it ceases to appeal to the public taste, and becomes a mere exercise and amusement for the student and for learned audiences. This was plainly the case with the later epic poets who were called *Cyclical*, and whose laboured accounts of the wars of gods, giants, and bygone men, roused the ire and fed the satire of Xenophanes and his contemporaries. It is perhaps not so easily proved, and will not be so readily admitted, that the lyric poetry of Pindar and Simonides, which was eclipsed by the rise of tragic poetry, showed plain traces of the same defects. The epitaphs of Simonides are indeed very striking, clear, and devoted to great national subjects ; but these can hardly be called a separate school of poetry, and were written with equal beauty and effect by many poets not exclusively lyric. What really damaged the national position of Simonides, with all his merits, was the feeling that he was a poet for pay—a poet of courts and despots, at a time when courts and despots were rapidly passing out of all favour and becoming the objects of a great national hate. The poetry of Pindar laboured under the same disadvantages. He celebrated, indeed, victories at the national games, but celebrated them for pay, and was ready to write for pay in honour of anybody—of Sicilian tyrants or Corinthian courtesans. There was, moreover, strongly marked in Pindar's poetry another quality, which we do not meet in the extant fragments of Simonides, and which heralds the decadence of lyric poetry—I mean that obscurity and elaborate richness which made him quite unintelligible to the masses. Literary men studied him, and admired him for these bold and daring flights ; but the mass of the Greek public had forgotten him and laid him aside in the very next generation, as we hear from Cratinus. Of course lyric poetry could not die in a moment ; but even as epic poetry had been transformed rather than destroyed in the odes of Stesichorus and Pindar, and in the dialogues of tragedy, so lyric poetry passed into the humbler sphere of being the handmaid of the drama, and filling up the gaps in the action of the piece. Whatever purely lyrical dramas and dithyrambs existed were

never successful, and have left only faint traces in the history of literature.

§ 7. The later fortunes and decay of tragedy, which occurred in a very advanced civilisation and a reading public, demand a more complicated history. When the majority of people begin to read, poetry loses its hold upon the public, and the prose writer, who composes with greater simplicity and less labour, at last obtains an advantage over his rival the poet, who is put into competition with all the older poets now circulating among a more learned public. It is here sufficient to repeat, as an additional illustration of the principle, that although in the Alexandrine epoch there were learned and even brilliant imitations of all species of old Greek poetry—the epics of Apollonius, the elegiacs of Callimachus, the lyrics of a false Anacreon, the tragedies of the Pleiad—one kind only of the varied products of that wonderfully prolific and greatly underrated age has held its place with all the critics and admirers of pure Greek poetry. This is the bucolic poetry of Theocritus, imitated, not from earlier literature, but from the people's songs, from the shepherds' pipe and ditty, from the fresh feelings of untutored hearts. It is indeed beyond the scope of the present work to develop such a theory further, but it is worthy of suggestion, that the history of the fine arts generally, nay even the political history of the world, shows perpetual examples of the same principle. The tendency of all human invention is to become conventional, then cramped, and then effete. It is to be revived only by breaking with venerable traditions, and going back to nature, to natural men and natural things, for new inspiration.

CHAPTER II.

THE TRACES OF POETRY BEFORE HOMER.

§ 8. WHEN we endeavour to discover the preliminary stages through which Greek poetry reached the perfect condition which produced the great epics, we find ourselves reduced to doubtful inferences and conjectures. The Homeric poems themselves tell us almost nothing on the subject. Apart from the two bards in the *Odyssey*—Demodocus at the Phæacian court, and Phemius among the suitors—who are distinctly epic singers of the same style and class as the author or authors of our remaining epics, we have only an allusion to one person, *Thamyris*, and to various choral songs of a lyric kind, sung at marriages and vintage scenes, or on other occasions of great grief or joy. We have also several earlier legends mentioned in such a way as to suggest that they had already been treated by bards such as *Phemius* and *Demodocus*.

§ 9. The facts which may with certainty be inferred from these allusions are: (1) that poets were common before the composition even of the *Iliad*, or oldest of the poems; (2) that the earlier poems were both lyric and epic in character; and (3) that there existed a feeling of rivalry, if not regular contests, in poetry. These latter are indeed openly asserted to have taken place in the old account of the contest between *Homer* and *Hesiod*, but are implied also in the reference to *Thamyris* (B 594),¹ ‘who boasted that he would conquer even were the Muses, the daughters of *Zeus*, to contend against him; but they in anger made him blind (*πηρόν*), and took away his

¹ The books of the *Iliad* are indicated in capitals, those of the *Odyssey* in small letters.

godlike song, and caused him to forget his cunning upon the lute.'

This famous passage occurs, it is true, in the *Catalogue*, which is perhaps the most suspicious part of the *Iliad*. But, on the other hand, it occurs in the account of the forces of Nestor from Pylus, and there is evidence that many other poetic legends were in vogue about this kingdom—legends perpetually cited in the reminiscences of the aged Nestor himself, whose very age seems to imply that he had been the subject of earlier ballads. This justifies the opinion that the mention of Thamyris¹ is really old, and points to the age before the composition of the *Iliad*. But, unfortunately, there is no hint as to the nature of his poetry. We cannot tell whether he composed lyric pieces such as the old dirges and marriage-songs, or whether he was an epic singer like Demodocus, or whether, again, he was an author of that early religious poetry, which was by later writers ascribed to the age before Homer.

After the days of Herodotus. we hear constantly of this religious poetry, which was of a mystical or symbolical character, and certainly of a very different type from the worldly Homer. But as to its antiquity, our authorities are not very encouraging. The first and most important is Herodotus, who says in a famous passage (ii. 50-4) in which he discusses the origin and names of the Hellenic gods: 'Whence the gods severally sprang, whether or not they had existed from all eternity, what forms they bore—these are questions of which the Greeks knew nothing till the other day, so to speak. For Homer and Hesiod were the first to compose Theogonies, and give the gods their epithets, to allot to them their several offices and occupations, and describe their forms; and they lived about 400 years before my time, and not more, as I believe. As for the poets who are thought by some to be earlier than these, they are, in my judgment, decidedly later.' And he adds presently: 'What I have said of Homer and Hesiod is my own opinion, and not borrowed from the priestesses of Dodona.'

I should consider this judgment as to the relative age of the

¹ Also called *Thamyras*, especially in a comedy of Antiphanes.

old Orphic and other religious poems (to which he clearly alludes) as of the greatest weight, were it not evident that Herodotus is here sustaining a favourite theory of his own, viz. that almost all the Greek religion, and especially all the mystic part of it, was borrowed from Egypt. Thus he says (ii. 81): 'Here their (the Egyptian) practice resembles the rites which are called Bacchic and Orphic, but which are in reality Egyptian and Pythagorean;' and it was a necessary part of this theory that these rites, and the poems belonging to them, should not be very ancient. I do not, therefore, think that the sceptical judgment of Herodotus, which he, with his usual honesty, confesses to be a peculiar opinion of his own, can be here decisive.¹ The frequent poetical allusions of Euripides to a collection of Orphic poems of pious and philosophic import can, on the other hand, afford no secure evidence of their antiquity, for we know that the school of Onomacritus, in the sixth century B.C., added considerably to the old religious poems, if it did not forge them wholesale. But the very fact of the forging of the name of Orpheus, Musæus, and others proves clearly the antiquity of these names, and that the poetry ascribed to them was of a character quite different from that of the Epos. The very frequent allusions of Plato, on the other hand, who even in three places quotes the words of Orpheus,² show clearly that he accepted Orpheus and Musæus, whom he usually co-ordinates, as ancient masters of religious song, and on a par with Homer and Hesiod. This general acceptance of Orpheus as a real personage, with no less frequent suspicions as to the genuineness of the current Orphic books, appears in other Greek writers; e.g. Aristotle³ cites the so-called Orphic poems, just as he cites the so-called Pythagorean books. Apart from these casual allusions, our really explicit authorities are the antiquaries of

¹ We might just as well accept the almost unanimous verdict of older tradition, and believe the Greek race to be autochthonous, and their civilisation perfectly original; whereas their eastern origin can be clearly demonstrated, quite apart from the discoveries of Herodotus and his school, from the surer evidence of architecture and the plastic arts, and from the results of comparative Linguistic.

² *Crat.* 402 B, *Phileb.* 66 C, *Legg.* 669 D.

³ *De Anima*, i. 5, 410 b; and elsewhere.

later days, to whom we owe almost all the definite knowledge we possess. Pausanias, in particular, not only speaks constantly of these poets, but refers to some of their hymns, which he had heard, and it is he and Strabo who afford us the materials for constructing a general theory about them.

§ 10. It is remarkable that the two races which tradition consistently asserts to have been the first civilisers of Greece are known in history as barbarians—the Pelasgi and the Thracians. Herodotus (i. 57) found remnants of the Pelasgi still living at Creston, Scylace and Placia, and he characterises their language as that of barbarians. The savagery of the Thracians was proverbial all through Hellenic history, and yet among the various obscure and doubtful statements of the legends, these are the only neighbouring peoples of which we can affirm with tolerable certainty that they were the forerunners of the Hellenes in culture. With the Pelasgi we are not much concerned. They were great builders and great reclaimers of land. They settled all over Greece, and especially in such rich plains as those of Thessaly and of Argos. But their literary character is nowhere attested. Nor have we remaining any certain trace of their language, save the words Argos and Larissa, which (as interpreted to mean *plain* and *fortress*) point to these very tastes. They seem to have been a peace-loving, quiet people ; and if they built everywhere great forts, such as was the Pelasgic ring wall of the Acropolis at Athens, they were not, like the Leleges or Minyans, famed for pillage and war. They must have been a settled and agricultural race, opposed to the roving pirates, whom they doubtless dreaded.

One fact connected with literature, and one only, may be traced to them. It was they who received from the Phœnicians the letters of the alphabet, adapted from the Egyptian hieratic character by these traders. The varying appellations of *Cadmean*, *Phœnician*, and *Pelasgic letters* seem clearly to attest this. Despite Herodotus' condemnation of their language, they were doubtless of Aryan descent¹ ; and one thing is clear, that the change of Greece from its Pelasgic to its Hellenic state was no

¹ Émile Burnouf believes them to have been akin to the present Albanians, whom later invasions have reinstated in many parts of Greece.

sudden revolution or conquest, but a gradual absorption of the older and weaker in the new. The most venerable elements in the Hellenic religion were adopted from them, and there is no nobler invocation in the Iliad than that of Achilles to the old Pelasgic Zeus of Dodona that ruled in the heavens.¹ This appeal agrees well with the interesting notice of Herodotus, that they worshipped their gods, but without names or divers functions, in simple and silent adoration. Hence it came that they were revered by the Romans for their religion.

§ 11. The legends about the Thracians are of quite a different order. This remarkable people appear from the notices of the Iliad to have been allied rather to the Phrygians than to the western Greeks. The Phrygians have been proved from the extant words of the language to be not only Aryans, but Aryans of the European branch; and thus we can conceive an early culture among the great Phrygio-Thracian tribes extending to the borders of Thessaly. However this may be, we hear of a school of Thracian minstrels, of whom Orpheus is the best known name, which is associated with the district of Pieria—a region not very clearly defined, and apparently moving gradually southward, till we find it about the slopes of Mount Olympus.²

These singers were specially devoted to the worship of the Muses—three goddesses who are always associated with wells and water-springs, and who were the special patronesses and inspirers of poetry.³ There are traces of these Thracian bards

¹ Cf. Π 233. Ζεῦ ἄνα, Δωδωναίε, Πελασγικέ, τηλόθι ναίων,
Δωδώνης μεδέων δυσχειμέρου κ. τ. λ.

² It has been well pointed out by many scholars that the legendary Thracians of Attica and the historical Thracians have nothing in common, and that not impossibly the mythical Thracians were pure Ionian Greeks (cf. Petersen in *Ersch und Gruber's Encyclop.* vol. lxxxv. p. 271); at all events, they were a distinct people, with a distinct religion and polity.

³ The names for them at Helicon were, in Pausanias' day, *μνήμη*, *μελέτη*, and *ᾠοιδή*; at Delphi, according to Plutarch, *ὑπάτη*, *μέση*, and *νήτη*, from the principal strings of the lyre. The three Charites of Orchomenus seem to correspond to them (Paus. ix. 35). In later days the number was nine, and the names quite different. Bergk absurdly suggests the Lydian *μων*=water, as the origin of *Μοῦσα*, which is rather = *μοντ-ja*, and connected with the root of *μάντις*.

down through the mountains of Phocis to Delphi and round about Parnassus; and still more certainly are they, and with them the worship of the Muses, associated with the northern slopes of Helicon. There is no range through all Greece so rich in springs and tumbling brooks as the northern slopes of Helicon, and men might well imagine it a favourite abode of goddesses, who loved this most speaking voice in nature. It is here that the author of the *Theogony*, ascribed to Hesiod—possibly Hesiod himself—fixes their abode, when he calls them to come from Pieria at the opening of his didactic poem. The establishment of the worship of the Muses, which the Thracian school had introduced from Pieria, is perfectly demonstrated by its persistence up to the days of Hesiod, and the so-called didactic and genealogical epics.

Attic legends seem to indicate that the Thracians were not mere singers, and that they sought to extend their influence still further. The legend of the war of Eumolpus, the Thracian warrior, king and bard, against Erechtheus, king of Athens, implies that the Thracians extended their power from the slopes of Helicon across the glades and gorges of Cithæron to its last spur—the citadel of Eleusis. This approach so threatened Athens, that the legends represent Erechtheus engaged in a desperate struggle with Eumolpus, and victorious only by the aid of human sacrifices—the voluntary death of his own daughters. This legend, now glorified by Mr. Swinburne's splendid drama, may have real facts underlying it; and it is, in any case, in consonance with the other hints collected by Strabo and Pausanias. Certain it is that the mysteries of Demeter and Persephone, celebrated by the Athenians at Eleusis all through history, were under the special direction of the clan of the Eumolpidæ, who professed to trace their origin to this Thracian ancestor. His name, like that of Musæus, shows clearly enough his connection with the old worship of the Muses, and their poetic inspiration.

§ 12. Our oldest direct evidence for Orpheus is the fact that in Peisistratus' day his name was sufficiently venerable to produce and protect extensive forgeries; but it is probable that Heraclitus, who could hardly have been deceived by Onomacritus,

believed not only in Orpheus, but in some of the extant writings attributed to him.¹ The mention of his poems by Pausanias is very interesting. 'Whoever,' says he, 'has made a critical study of poetry, knows that the hymns of Orpheus are each composed in the briefest form, and are altogether very few in number. The Lycomidæ (an Attic clan) know them and sing them in accompaniment to the ceremonies (of the mysteries). In elegance they would rank second after the hymns of Homer, at any rate, but they are more highly honoured than these on account of their religious spirit.' In another place (i. 14, 3), he distinctly rejects poems attributed to Orpheus, and doubtfully to Musæus. This Musæus was supposed to have been a pupil or successor to Orpheus.

There are other names which Pausanias considers still older—Linus, the personification of the Linus song mentioned by Homer, and from early times identified more or less with the Adonis song of the Phœnicians and the Maneros of the Egyptians. After Linus came the Lycian Olen, the oldest composer of Greek hymns known (Paus. ix. 27, 2), whose style was adopted by Orpheus, and also by Pamphos, the oldest hymn-poet among the Athenians. A hymn of this Pamphos to Eros was sung at the mysteries by the Lycomidæ, along with those of Orpheus. Several of his hymns are referred to by Pausanias. With the old Delphic contests in music and poetry were connected Chrysothemis, Philammon, and his son Thamyris, who were said to be the first three victors recorded at these contests. Orpheus and Musæus were distinctly reported to have abstained from contending, as being of too great fame, and also connected with a different worship.² The names of Bakis and

¹ Bergk calls attention to Euripides' *Alcestis* (v. 967) and the scholia. Cf. for the following statement, Pausanias, ix. 30, 12.

² The various relations or genealogies of these poets referred to by Pausanias, Diodorus, and Suidas are irreconcilable, and are, indeed, not worth reconciling. Some called Thamyris the eighth poet before Homer, some the sixth. Charops, Œagrus, Orpheus, Musæus, Eumolpus, Philammon, Thamyris, is one suggested order. The object of these legends is various: first, to account for the transference of the mysteries and their poetical rites from Thrace to Athens; secondly, to bring the Delphic oracle

Lycus were known as the authors of antique oracles, all of them probably spurious. This only is to be observed about the old responses of the Delphic oracle, that while the extant *rhetra* of Lycurgus seems to be literally an oracular response in the Delphic dialect, we are told that the hexameter verse was first invented at Delphi, either by Phemonoe, the first priestess, or by Olen, when he founded the prophetic shrine.

This inquiry into the poetry of the Greeks before Homer leads us to some very natural and some very strange results. In the first place, no educated Greek, except perhaps Herodotus, seems to have denied the existence of poems, far less of poets, anterior to Homer. The tradition about these poets is all the more trustworthy, because they are not represented in any sense as forerunners of Homer. For, in the second place, all the poems attributed to these men were either lyrical or oracular; they were all short, and they were all strictly religious.¹ In these features they contrasted broadly with the epic school of Homer. Even the hexameter metre seems not to have been used in these old hymns, and was called a new invention of the Delphic priestess. Still further, the majority of these hymns is connected with mysteries apparently ignored by Homer, or with the worship of Dionysus, which he hardly knew.

§ 13. Indeed the Homeric poems seem to ignore all Pelasgian religion (save in a single appeal to Zeus); they seem to ignore the Thracian bards and their Muse-worship; they speak of the rich shrine of Delphi without even naming an oracle. It is therefore plain that if these early bards were really the forerunners of Homer in time, they can in nowise be called his teachers or forerunners in poetry. He seems to start from quite a fresh commencement, like Archilochus, like Æschylus, like Theocritus, and to start up among a people who knew poetry, but of a different sort.

What, then, were the real beginnings of Epic poetry, and who prepared the way for the great Iliad as we have it? To

—really a different religion—into relation with them; and, lastly, to satisfy the universal desire of bringing great men of old into near relationship.

¹ Thus of Thamyris the lexicographers say: *ἔγραψε μέλη καὶ ᾠσματα*.

this question we can only answer by a probable theory, which now indeed has been accepted by many competent critics, which is however not based directly on positive facts, but on reasonable inferences. The hexameter verse was commonly attributed to the Delphic priests, who were said to have invented and used it in oracles. In other words, it was early used in religious poetry. If we examine its structure, as opposed to the shorter and more varied lyric measures, it is evidently composed and intended for sustained narrative, and for poems of considerable length. There is no doubt that the priests did compose such works for the purpose of teaching the attributes and adventures of the gods, and bringing into harmony the various local myths concerning them. These genealogies of the gods were called *Theogonies*, and we have still under the name of Hesiod a poem of this class, which, though later than Homer, appears to have been composed upon a far earlier model, and affords an example of these didactic religious works. It may be that the earlier lyric hymns contained short descriptions, such as we find them—an epic element—in the remains of Pindar and Stesichorus; but the superior evenness and calm of the hexameter must soon have made this species of verse generally preferred for narrative purposes.

§ 14. With the gods were closely connected the heroes, who ruled over the tribes in these old feudal days, and it was impossible to treat of the descendants of the gods without recording the legends of older days in the history of the nation. So the genealogies and acts of demigods and of men came to be treated in connection with the *Theogonies* of the priests. Such old genealogical epics were said to have survived long among the Peloponnesians. But the secular element gradually gained ground, especially among the luxurious and worldly Ionians, and a class of bards who were not priests began to treat the histories of the heroes and their adventures, in fact, the κλέα ἀνδρῶν¹ of Homer, which delighted the Ionic chiefs and their

¹ This phrase—the acts of renowned men—seems almost a technical one. Achilles (I 189) αἶδε δ' ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν, in his tent, evidently older heroes; so again, v. 524, οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν κ. τ. λ. Again (θ 73), Μοῦσ' ἄρ' αἰοῖδ' ἀνῆκεν αἰδέεσθαι κλέα ἀνδρῶν; and so Hesiod,

courts. Thus epic poetry, from having been purely religious, became purely secular. After having treated men and heroes in subordination to the gods, it came to treat the gods in relation to men. Indeed it may be said of Homer, that in the image of man created he God.¹ The statement of Herodotus, that Homer and Hesiod—the poet of adventure and the genealogist—made the religion of the Greeks, and assigned to the gods their epithets and functions, is apparently true, and full of import.²

We must take care not to understand him as if these poems had created or even commenced this transmutation. It is plain enough that Homer and Hesiod represent, both theologically and socially, the *close* of a long epoch, and not the youth of the Greek world, as some have supposed. The real signification of many myths is lost to them, and so is the import of most of the names and titles of the elder gods, which are archaic and strange, while the subordinate personages generally have purely Greek names. Such epithets as *Argeiphontes*, *Tritogeneia*, and *Philommeides* (laughter-loving) seem purely traditional; indeed, the latter is wrongly interpreted by Hesiod (*Theog.* 198) from μήδεα. Speculations about these words were common in the Boeotian school. Some picturesque epithets, such as νύξ·θοή, which seem to indicate the first surprise of northern tribes at the rapid sunsets in southern Greece, may be also traditional, and derived from old hieratic poetry.

But in Homer's time the whole character of popular

Theog. 99, who shows the combination of the gods and heroes in this sort of poetry,

αὐτὰρ ἀοιδὸς

Μουσᾶων θεράπων κλέϊα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων

δμῆσῃ μάκαρς τε θεοὺς οἱ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν.

Cf. also the *Hymn to Del. Apollo*, 160. These passages are collected by Bergk, *Literaturgeschichte*, i. p. 347.

¹ Cf. Aristotle, *Pol.* i. 1 (p. 1252 b) for this oft-repeated idea.

² Bernhardt (*Hist. Lit.* ii. 1, 78) cautions us against allowing Herodotus' words to comprise the real *religion* of the Greeks, which was kept up by simple prayer and devotion. It was the combination of plastic art with epic poetry which made the *mythology* of Homer and Hesiod prominent. So also Croiset (*Lit. grecque*, i. 80) rejects Herodotus' statement on account of the number of *hieratic epithets* in Homer, which seem of non-epic origin.

religion had become altered and humanised ; the wars, and adventures, and passions of men had become the centre of interest among the poets. We must not imagine that the older and simpler religion wholly disappeared. As the common people went on singing their Linus and Ialemus, and jesting at their marriage and vintage feasts, so schools of priests and didactic bards kept up the old genealogical epics about the gods and their human descendants, especially in the poorer Peloponnesus, and in Bœotia, while the rich and prosperous Ionians revelled in the glories of Homer. But so strongly was the predominance of the Ionic epos felt, that the Ionic dialect was universally adopted in didactic poems ; and genealogical poems, nay, even the responses of the Delphic oracle, were composed in this dialect, which was widely different from most of those spoken in Greece proper.

The great brilliancy of Homer has completely eclipsed all the earlier stages of the Epos. He alludes to many stories which appear to have been treated before him in shorter lays ; he speaks of the hunt of Calydon, of the exploits of Nestor, of the labours of Heracles, of the good ship Argo, as well known ; he alludes to the wars of the gods, and cites a Catalogue of famous women. It may be well not to conclude this preliminary sketch without noting these epic subjects referred to in the Iliad and Odyssey, as well as the chief popular songs which Homer mentions, and which have left some traces even in historical times.

§ 15. Taking the Iliad separately, as the older of the poems, and therefore furnishing the clearest evidence as to what earlier epic lays must have existed, we find a considerable body of stories mentioned in such a way as to make it extremely probable that they were no mere current popular tales, but had been poetically treated. This is surely the case with the legends of the wars and conflicts among the gods in A 396 sq., E 380 sq., Z 130 sq., O 10 sq. Some of these are conflicts for supremacy among the gods ; others are quarrels about or with men. Both are quite foreign to popular poetry, and show the influence of a school of priests or theologians who were rapidly becoming secular. The actual battle of the gods in Φ is a speci-

men of this sort of work. There is less obvious, but still distinct mention of genealogical epics in Σ 38 sq. and Ξ 201, 246. But the great mass of legends alluded to are the adventures of earlier heroes, such as Tydeus, Meleager, Heracles, and Bellerophon; as well as of celebrated wars, such as those with the Amazons and Centaurs. There are even earlier legends about heroes at the Trojan war presupposed, as is the case with Achilles and Hector among those present, and Philoctetes and Protesilaus, among those absent or dead. Even should it be held that some of these were mere current talk, preserved among the people as oft-told tales, yet such is the number of them, and such the character of some of them, that no fair critic could possibly deny the existence of a large number of shorter lays of an epic character earlier than the Iliad, and even presupposed by it.

§ 16. Let us pass to the popular poems alluded to in the same way. Euripides, who was something of an antiquary, draws 'a picture of women at the loom, like Calypso and Circe in the Odyssey, singing epic lays to the sound of the plying shuttle.¹ In his day no such custom existed; whether he is correct in drawing this picture, we cannot now tell; he is certainly the best authority we could have in his own time.

As Linus and Ialemus were afterwards personified as sons of the Muses, the subjects of sad ditties sung on various occasions among the people, so Hymenæus was the personified marriage song, of which we find distinct mention in Homer.² All these were evidently choral performances, accompanied by pipes and harps, as well as by a dancing chorus of youths, and

¹ οὐτ' ἐπὶ κερκίσιν,
 οὔτε λόγοις
 φάτιν ἄϊον εὐτυχίας μετέχειν
 θεόθεν τέκνα θνατοῖς,

says his chorus (*Ion*, v. 506). And again, v. 196 of the same play,

ὅς ἐμαῖσι μυ-
 θεύεται παρὰ πῆναις
 ἀσπιστὰς Ἰόλαος.

² The scholiast on Σ 570 gives the following specimen of the Linus

the last was sung during the procession of the bride to her new home. So the Threnus or funeral dirge seems a choral song, but with solos interspersed, as may be inferred from the descriptions in the last books of the Iliad and Odyssey. Hecuba, Helen, and Andromache each make a separate lament over the body of Hector, and this seems an expansion of the simpler and shorter account.¹ In the Odyssey the nine Muses lead

song, which has been variously emended and restored. I quote it according to Bergk's version (*Fragg. Lyr.* p. 1297)—

ὦ Λίνε πᾶσι θεοῖσιν
 τετιμένε, σοὶ γὰρ ἔδωκαν
 πρῶτον μέλος ἀνθρώποισιν
 φωναῖς λιγυραῖς αἰεῖσαι·
 Φοῖβος δὲ κότφ σ' ἀναιρεῖ,
 Μοῦσαι δέ σε θρηνέουσιν.

Probably the dialect of this song has been considerably modernised, but the metre seems very primitive, and is probably that from which the hexameter was formed. The lines vary in pairs, and may be called either logœdic or dactylic, with or without an anacrusis, thus : $\underline{\text{v}} \mid \text{---} \text{---} \mid \text{---} \text{---} \mid \text{---}$. Leaving out the first anacrusis, we find that each pair of these lines, with at times the slightest alteration, can form an hexameter. This origin would also account for the importance of the strong cæsura in hexameters, which was, in fact, the old point of junction of separate lines. We have fragments of Hymenæal hymns by Sappho (*Fragg.* 91 sq., Bergk), of which the first may possibly be an imitation of the old popular form :—

ἴψοι δὴ τὸ μέλαθρον
 "Γμήναον
 ἀέρρετε τέκτονες ἄνδρες
 "Γμήναον
 γάμβρος ἔρχεται ἴσος "Αρευῖ
 "Γμήναον
 ἄνδρος μεγάλῳ πόλῳ μείζων
 "Γμήναον.

Here the metre is apparently the same as in the Linus song. It is not probable that the beautiful chorus of Euripides' *Phaethon*, beginning ὕμην, ὕμην, is meant for a hymenæus, it seems rather an ode to Aphrodite. See a criticism, however, of this origin of the hexameter in Croiset, *Lit. grecque*, i. 68.

¹ Ω 720 :

παρὰ δ' εἶσαν ἀοιδούς,
 θρήνων ἐξάρχους, οἵτε στονέεσαν ἀοιδὴν
 οἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἐθρήνεον, ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες.

the Threnus, supported by the Nereids. If we are to trust the descriptions of the Iliad, the Threnus was not a fixed formula, but a rehearsal of the virtues of the dead—a form of lament common to almost all ages and nations. Of course the epic poet must have modified the original metre, which can hardly have been hexameter.

The rest of the fragments of that Greek popular poetry which may have been in vogue before Homer, but which is not actually mentioned in the poems, will be better discussed in connection with the origin of lyric poetry. The comic or lighter poems ascribed to Homer, such as the *Margites* and *Eiresione*, which show peculiarities in metre and style of great interest, will be treated after the Homeric hymns. Enough has here been quoted to prove the widespread practice of dancing and playing together with lyric singing, partly religious, like the pæan of supplication or of victory,¹ partly secular, such as war-dances and dances at feasts. We have also shown the almost certain existence of shorter epics, both heroic and genealogical. Such were the conditions of literature from which Homer or the Homeric poems sprang.²

¹ A 473, X 391.

² Niese (*Ent. der hom. Poesie*, Berlin, 1882) has an excursus arguing against the existence of any popular poetry, or of parallel epic stories, earlier than the Iliad. He thinks all the other epic stories grew out of, and were attached to, it and the Odyssey. Nevertheless, he admits that the dialect of the poems from the commencement was a highly artificial one, and specially constructed for them (p. 13). Is it possible that this should be the earliest poetry of a poetical nation? That the Iliad and Odyssey either absorbed or superseded earlier attempts is of course what we should reasonably expect. Cf. the note of Sittl, *Lit. Gesch.* i. p. 34, and p. 41.

CHAPTER III.

THE HOMERIC POEMS.—HISTORY OF THEIR TRANSMISSION
FROM THE EARLIEST DAYS.—EDITIONS, SCHOLIA, ETC.

§ 17. THE first great problem which meets us when we approach this subject is that of the origin and composition of the Homeric poems. Was this wonderful species of Greek literature created by the transcendent genius of a single man, or was it the outgrowth of a series of lesser men and lesser poems? Is Homer a real and historical person, or is he only the imaginary author to whose single genius was ascribed the combined excellence of many men, together with the organising and combining talent of later hands? Were the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* handed down from prehistoric days substantially in the form which they now present, and did the arrangers (*διασκεύασται*) of Solon's and later days only restore the original order, or were the elements of these works lying in their original disorder and confusion when Onomacritus, or Theagenes, or Antimachus brought them into unity, thus creating an *Iliad* and an *Odyssey* which had never before existed?

This is the first great question on which an historian of Greek literature must make up his mind. It is not to be expected that he will now be able to discover a new theory, seeing that all possible hypotheses have already been suggested. It is not to be expected that he will reconcile the majority of scholars, who, having long since compromised themselves by declaring for various solutions, will not desire, or indeed be able, to shake off their long-adopted and cherished convictions. But what is fairly to be demanded from him is a critical estimate of the controversy up to its latest stage, and a survey of

how much certainty has been attained, and how much doubt still remains, in the present state of Homeric controversy. Nor is it fair to the student that this survey should be concluded without the critic's venturing to express his own convictions on the subject.

Perhaps the best way of approaching these complicated and difficult problems is, in the first instance, to dispose of the external history of the poems.

§ 18. We need but cast a passing glance at the legends current among the Greeks about Homer as a person, and as the author of the great epics. It is quite certain that the extant lives of Homer, attributed to Herodotus and to Plutarch, have no authority, and that even the most critical inquirers of an earlier age could find out nothing trustworthy about him.¹ The very name of the poet has been variously explained, and has given rise to long controversies. The older meanings of *hostage*, *companion*, or *blind* have given way before the theory that the name is somehow compounded with ὁμοῦ. Welcker suggested ὁμοῦ and ἄρω, in the sense of 'connector of lays.' Upon this G. Curtius observes that the root ἄρ had originally an intransitive sense, so that with this derivation the word would mean the 'bond of union,' or centre-point of the legends.²

¹ See the critical discussion of these lives, eight in number, in Sengebusch's *Hom. Diss. prior*, pp. 1 sq. Four are anonymous, another attributed to Porphyry, and one of the fullest is in Suidas' *Lexicon*. None of them seems to be older than the age of Augustus, and some of them are certainly as late as the 2nd century A.D. That attributed to Plutarch (who had really written upon Homer) is not more genuine than that ascribed to Herodotus. The extant ἀγών, or contest of Homer and Hesiod, though it may preserve old legends, mentions Hadrian, and is therefore not prior to his reign. Modern critics refer its origin to Alkidamas.

² But, as Sengebusch and others observe, this derivation would imply among Æolians and Dorians a form *Ομαῖρος, which never occurs. All the Doric citations agree in the form *Ομηρος. This seems to show that the original form was not *Ομαῖρος, but *Ομερος or *Ομαῖρος, and this not formed from ὁμοῦ and εἶρω (which would give as dialectical forms *Ομῖρος and *Ομερρος), but from ὁμοῦ, with a mere suffix, in the sense of 'the harmonious.' This is the derivation preferred by Düntzer and Sengebusch. Upon this theory it may be identified with the Ὀμύρης, and the more celebrated Θάυρις,

§ 19. The still wider controversies as to the age and the birthplace of the poet were idle and resultless, till new light came to be thrown upon the causes of the variations among the ancients, first by the researches of Carl Müller, and more recently by Sengebusch. We will consider the dates first. These may be fairly divided into those of conjecture, and those of tradition. Thus, among the former, Crates placed Homer 60 years after the Trojan war ; Philochorus 180 years ; Eratosthenes 240 years ; others in Archilochus' or Lycurgus' times. Müller was the first to show that in these chronological speculations the learned Greeks used astronomical cycles, particularly that of sixty solar years, which corresponded to sixty-three lunar. Hence the apparently precise number of years *post Troica* merely mean the number of cycles, or multiples of sixty, which were supposed to have elapsed, of which the seventh coincided with Lycurgus, and the eighth with Archilochus.

These speculations were, however, suggested by the traditional dates asserted in sundry towns, which laid claim to have been the poet's birthplace or residence, and the dates vary from the Athenian tradition, which places him at the supposed time of the Ionic migration (circ. 1043 B.C.), to the Cretan, which places him in the days of Thaletas (670-40). The particular dates variously assigned during this period by the cities are shown with great probability to be determined by genealogical if not by astronomical reasons. In the genealogies preserved by the Ionic clans or *gentes* in the Asiatic towns, the generation was specified in which Homer was born. Three generations were allowed for a century. Hence the Colophonians placed his birth at Colophon, 132 years before the first Olympiad ; the first year of which, being included, makes up four generations. The 400 years which Herodotus (cf. above, p. 9) mentions as the interval between himself and Homer means twelve generations, perhaps in the genealogies of the Samians, to which he attached great importance. We thus obtain a logical reason for the apparent precision in the numbers of the years assigned as the dates of Homer's birth.

who are mentioned as related to the poet. The whole matter is carefully argued by Sengebusch (*Diss. Hom. prior*, pp. 89-100).

§ 20. How shall we account for the extraordinary divergence of place and of date? From a careful comparison of these legends Sengebusch was led to the important result that they severally note the establishing of a Homeric school of rhapsodes in the various cities, and from this evidence he endeavours to construct a history of the spread of epic schools of poetry through Greece. Thus, starting from the tradition of the Athenians, which Aristarchus adopted (possibly from Theagenes), that Homer was an Athenian, he holds him, or his poetry, to have migrated with the Ionic settlers, first to the island of Ios (according to the tradition of that people), then to Smyrna, at the time when the Kymæans sent a colony there. These earliest notices may possibly refer to a personal Homer. The traditions of the Chians, Colophonians, Samians, Milesians, as well as of the Cyprians, Cretans, and Lacedæmonians, he interprets as simply the recollection of the first settlement of epic schools—that of Crete by Thaletas. When poems with local allusions (such as the Chian Hymn to Apollo) came to be composed by succeeding poets, these allusions were ascribed to the original Homer, and his birthplace asserted in accordance with them. It is a remarkable corroboration of this theory, that the successive dates assigned by the various towns correspond to the natural spread of the Ionic race in the Eastern Levant—Cyprus and Crete being the latest points (with the latest traditional dates); Ios and Smyrna the earliest, and directly attached to the Athenian date, which asserts Homer to have gone out with the Ionic migration.

§ 21. There are many traces that the poems early attained a great and widespread reputation. Midas, king of Phrygia, and Gyges, king of Lydia, who lived shortly after the year 700 B.C., are said to have patronised Greek rhapsodists at their courts, as we hear from Nicolaus of Damascus. But whatever doubts may be entertained about these kings, it is probable that the prominent place given to Lycian, Rhodian, and Cretan heroes points to recitation in these countries, a long way from the original home of the poems. The enumeration in the *Catalogue* of Rhodes, Cos, and other adjoining islands, on the

Greek side, though their situation would naturally place them with the Mysian cities, among the allies of the Trojans, is a clear evidence how strong an interest was taken in the poems by the chiefs of these islands. This far-reaching influence is also proved by the adoption of both metre and dialect of the Ionic epos by the Delphic oracle, and by the Boeotian school of Hesiod. It is further proved by the consistent avoidance of Homer's subjects in the cyclic poems, or by other epic composers, who flourished during an epoch reaching back from Solon's day for a long period. Lastly, the legend that Lycurgus brought the poems to Sparta, though perhaps a mere copy of the more authentic stories of Solon's care to preserve them, points to the belief that they were early known and prized in the Peloponnesus. This is corroborated by Herodotus' story (v. 67), that Cleisthenes forbade poetic contests in reciting Homer at Sicyon, on account of the prominence the poet had given to Argos. The chest of Cypselus, an old work of art described by Pausanias, had among its pictures scenes from both Iliad and Odyssey.

§ 22. The first difficulty which arises, if we admit this early date for the composition of the Iliad, is to account for its preservation and transmission down to the time of Solon. It was believed in old times that both poems were really written by Homer, and then transcribed and preserved by schools of rhapsodists. This opinion was exploded as soon as any close criticism was brought to bear upon it, and has never been maintained since Wolf's refutation, till resuscitated by Bergk, who endeavours to prove that writing, even general writing, was much older in Greece than has been supposed, and, though he still maintains that the composition¹ of a great

¹ I am convinced that it is rather the *composition* than the *transmission* of the great epics which postulates the use of letters. It is the planning and executing the structure which seems unattainable without writing. This is now strongly maintained by Fick as regards the Odyssey. Croiset, however, adds (i. 172) an important point. Whatever use the composers made of writing, it was for an *audience*, not a *reading* public, and how vindicate the *composition* of such immense poems for such a public? The gathering in, therefore, of short recitations into long epics presupposes the systematic recitations of an age far later than the Homeric. Tradition made it that of Peisistratus.

epic such as the *Iliad* is impossible without writing, holds that it probably marks the very time when this instrument of literature first came into use, and was applied to perpetuate the passing thoughts of men. But when he fixes this epoch as the tenth century B.C., we may well hesitate and wonder, in spite of the ingenuity of his arguments. He has indeed established, or rather recent discoveries have established, one thing, that the first common use of writing had been generally fixed at too late a date. An inscription scrawled by Greek mercenaries under Psamatichus, in Upper Egypt, has proved that some of this class¹ could write easily about the year 600 B.C.—probably fifty years sooner.²

This discovery makes it almost certain that the Homeric poems were, or could have been, written down about 700 B.C., and thus they may have been preserved orally only for a very short time. The analogy of early French and German epics is quoted to prove that even when writing exists and is known, very long poems are preserved and recited orally without seeking aid from this invention. But there existed in the early Middle Ages a severance between the bard and the literary classes quite foreign to Greek life, and I am convinced that the rhapsodists did not delay to seize the advantage offered to them.

§ 23. As to the oral preservation and transmission before the art of writing, many scholars have cited cases of extraordinary memory in bards and strolling minstrels, and there is no impossibility in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* having been so preserved, especially by such schools or guilds of rhapsodists as

¹ It is usual to say 'even such hirelings' could then write; and this argument is employed both by Bergk and Professor Geddes to argue a wide and therefore not recent diffusion of writing. Both of them forget that it was often the highest classes—exiled nobles like Alcæus and Antimenidas—who served as mercenaries, and on account of their literary talents, which raised up enemies against them at home. But the treasures of Tiryns and Mycenæ contain no writing, though an advanced art.

² This depends upon whether we take the Psammetichus then reigning to be the first or the second of the name. Cf. Kirchhoff, *Studien zur Gesch. des griech. Alphabets*. Wiedemann (*Gesch. Egypt.*) argues for the second. The first is the more probable.

certainly existed in Greece. In fact, in addition to Creophylus of Samos and Cynæthus of Chios,¹ both of whom are mentioned as friends of Homer, or early preservers of his poetry, the main source of early traditions about Homer seems to be the clan of Homeridæ, at Chios, who claimed him as their founder, and who recited his epics through Greece. In the Hymn to the Delian Apollo one of these bards speaks of himself, and we know of contests being held among them, such as are described in the alleged contest between Homer and Hesiod. So little difficulty, indeed, does there appear to have been in preserving the poems, that a quantity of epic songs came down to historical times, and was even generally referred to Homer, until a more critical taste separated the wheat from the chaff, and acknowledged the two great poems only. And not only were there many additional poems, and many additions made within the poems by the rhapsodists, but owing to the fact that they were usually recited in cantos, these fragments were handed down in loose and uncertain order.

§ 24. We must conceive *Homer* as reaching the first *literary* epoch in Greece in some such condition. With the studies of Solon, a new stage begins in the history of the poems. There seems little doubt of the fact, hinted at by Pausanias and Plutarch, but explicitly stated only in late scholia—that not only did Peisistratus and his son Hipparchus takes every pains to circulate the old epics, by establishing or encouraging musical and poetical contests, at which recitations took place, but that there was even a sort of literary commission appointed to re-arrange and edit the poems,² consisting of Orpheus of

¹ On Cynæthus cf. the curious discussion of Fick, *Odys.* pp. 278 sq., who shows that Cynæthus introduced the Homeric poems at Syracuse (he thinks about 660 B.C.), and probably composed the late parts of the *Odyssey*.

² Nitzhorn and Niese have adopted from Lehrs' work (2nd ed. pp. 445 sq.) his doubts about the whole story. I acknowledge the frequent absurdities of our accounts, which relegate Zenodotus and Aristarchus to the days of Peisistratus, but still I believe in there being an authentic tradition, in spite of the able summary of arguments against it by Niese (*op. cit.* 4 sq.), adopted also by Sittl, *L.G.* i. pp. 66 sq. Aristotle's just-recovered *Αθ. Πολ.* says nothing about Peisistratus' literary tastes.

Croton, Zopyrus of Heraclea, Onomacritus of Athens, and of a fourth, whose name is not to be made out, owing to a corruption of the text of the scholion.¹ It is asserted that the version or edition of the poems which they sanctioned rapidly superseded all others; that it was the archetype from which the well-known *city editions* were long afterwards copied, and we know that these were the oldest and most trustworthy materials which the Alexandrine critics used. At the same time, we have distinct tradition that Onomacritus, apparently for political purposes, interpolated lines of his own, and this raises a suspicion that the commission may have handled the great epics with somewhat reckless hands.

§ 25. There are modern critics who think that to Onomacritus we owe the whole unity and structure of the great epics, which had never been before united, and that he not only brought together the separate lays, but welded them together artistically, so as to produce the poems as we now have them. This opinion, which must be discussed at greater length hereafter, is, in the first place, in distinct conflict with our tradition, which states that he *restored* unity to the poems which had been so composed, but separated and corrupted by recitation.² There are also clear evidences of a conservative spirit in the old arrangers of the *Īliad* and *Odyssey*; for they left in the poems a number of repetitions and inconsistencies, which

¹ It is *κατέπλογκύλω*, in which Cramer suspects the epic cycle was mentioned, but in what connection?

² It is reported (Diog. Laert. i. 57, and Plato's *Hipparch.* 228 B) that Solon ordered the poems to be recited by the rhapsodes *ἐξ ὑποβολῆς* and *ἐξ ὑπολήψεως*. These expressions are anything but clear to us, and have afforded the Germans scope for endless discussions. It results, I think, from the researches of Nitzsch that *ὑποβολή* means probably a *text*, or authoritative list of lays, to which the rhapsodists were ordered to adhere. *Ἐξ ὑπολήψεως* is by no means so clear, but is fairly explained by Bernhardt as implying fixed divisions or lays in the poems, which were to be sung entire, and each of which was matched against other similar divisions in the contests. Perhaps it does not differ materially from the other phrase, with which it is not, I think, used in common (cf. Sengebusch, ii. p. 111). In the Teian Inscr. (C. I. G. 3088) *ὑποβολή* is a subject of competition for boys, and means *recitation*. In Xenophon it means *prompting*.

they could have easily removed, had they intended to produce a new and harmonious whole. What is more important, there is no attempt traceable to interfere with the Homeric gods, and to substitute for them a more moral and philosophic religion ; still less any allusion to the Orphic ideas and mysteries, which had in Onomacritus' day become very prevalent in Greece. There is also no attempt to magnify the glories of Athens. It may be held certain that changes in this direction could not but have been attempted, had the commission of Peisistratus not confined themselves to arranging and sifting extant materials. This, then, was the earliest literary criticism on the Iliad and Odyssey, and all the rhapsodising of the poems of which we are told was at Athens, and in connection with this edition, though it was merely the continuance of an old and widespread fashion.

There seems little doubt that the early critics did not confine themselves to the Iliad and Odyssey, but embraced all the kindred epics which were at that time, or perhaps after that time, indiscriminately ascribed to Homer.¹ It is probable that the commission did not attempt any critical severance of the wheat from the chaff, and that in the course of succeeding studies these inferior poems were condemned one after another to lose their high claims to the name of Homer.

§ 26. Thus the gradual sifting of the large body of old epic poetry appears to have begun by the gathering and ordering of all the materials by Onomacritus. In the next generation Theagenes of Rhegium was the first professedly critical writer about the Iliad whom the Greeks knew. Then comes Stesimbrotus of Thasos, towards the latter half of the

¹ The list given by Suidas shows to what extent this was done : ἀναφέρεται δὲ εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ἄλλα τινα ποιήματα· Ἀμαζονία, Ἰλιάς μικρά, Νόστοι, Ἐπικυλίδες, Ἡθιέπακτος ἦτοι Ἰαμβοί, Μυοβατραχομαχία, Ἀραχνομαχία, Γερανομαχία, Κεραμεῖς, Ἀμφιαράου ἐξέλασις, Παίγνια, Σικελίας ἔλωσις, Ἐπιθαλάμια, Κύκλος, Ὕμνοι, Κύπρια. Of these some are completely unknown, and none have maintained their claim even in old Greek days. It does not include the *Margites*, which was acknowledged genuine by Aristotle.

fifth century B.C.; and he again is followed by his pupil Antimachus of Colophon, during the Peloponnesian war—himself an unsuccessful epic poet, but the critical editor of a text of Homer. Thus every generation since Solon had its Homeric studies. Indeed, at the time of the middle comedy these critics were so prominent as to be ridiculed upon the stage. We know that Aristotle discussed the poems, and is even said to have prepared a special edition for Alexander. The copy thus prepared was carried in a precious Persian casket, and hence known as *ἡ ἐκ τοῦ νάβηκος*. The quotations from Homer to be found through Aristotle are numerous, and differ remarkably from our texts, while those made by Plato are according to our texts. Ammonius wrote a book about Plato's citations, and yet all the critics are silent about Aristotle's text, which had been lost when the school of Alexandria began its labours. But there remain fragments of his six books of problems about Homer, and his school busied themselves with these questions also. We can infer that Aristotle used a worse text, and was a worse Homeric critic, than Plato.

The series of Attic editors and critics concludes with Demetrius Phalereus, who wrote on both the epics.

§ 27. In addition to the professed criticisms on the text, which were not many, there were endless allusions to, and discussions about, Homer all through the course of Greek history. 1. (a) Among the early *poets* Hesiod, though intentionally silent about the Ionic epic,¹ was noted in the scholia as implying in many places a knowledge of the *Iliad*.² Similar allusions are found to Archilochus, Alcman, Stesichorus, in fact, in all the older poets. Simonides of Ceos seems the earliest who mentioned Homer himself as distinguished from his poems.³ He also seems to refer the Theban cycle of poems to Homer. Bacchylides is quoted as referring Homer's birthplace to Ios. Pindar calls him both a Chian and a Smyrnæan, and comments on the morality of his praise of Odysseus. He furthermore

¹ I agree with Sengebusch (ii. 11) that the three passages in which he is supposed to mention Homer are spurious.

² Twenty places are cited by Sengebusch, *D. II.* ii. 8.

³ He calls him a Chian poet, quoting *Z* 146.

seems to have referred the *Cypria* to Homer. (β) As regards the tragic poets, not only did Æschylus profess his tragedies to be morsels (τεμάχην) from the mighty banquets of Homer, but Sophocles 'copied the *Odyssey* in many dramas,' and his vulgar admirers were wont to call him *the tragic Homer*. (γ) Passing on to satyric and comic poetry, we still have the *Cyclops* of Euripides, many Homeric titles of other satyric dramas from Æschylus, and the rest, and indeed the *Margites* is named in the *Poetics* as the direct forerunner of comedy. This is especially true of the middle comedy, in which types of character were ridiculed. The learned epics of the fourth century B.C. will be considered hereafter.

2. (α) The early *logographers*, who wrote much on genealogies, were often cited by after critics both for differing on such points from Homer, and also for their pedigrees of Homer and the other ancient poets. (β) The allusions to Homer in Herodotus and Thucydides are frequent and highly interesting. On the whole, Herodotus seems the more critical, as he rejects the *Cypria*, while Thucydides accepts the *Hymn to the Delian Apollo*, though well disposed to reject the legends of 'the old poets.' It is also to be remarked that their references show considerable variations from the present text. It is discussed by Greek grammarians and by Germans whether Herodotus or Thucydides resembled Homer more closely in style and tone of thought—a ridiculous debate, seeing that Herodotus was both by temper and by education steeped in epic poetry and ways of thinking, to which Thucydides was in most respects antagonistic. Both these authors, however, as they treated a definite portion of later history, only mention Homer incidentally. (γ) Later historians, such as Ephorus, who gave a general history of Greece from the earliest times, and geographers like Strabo, naturally paid him more attention.

3. All the *philosophers* were obliged to consider Homer as the source of the popular notions, not only in theology and in morals, but also in physics. They may be divided either into *opponents* of Homer, as an immoral and false teacher, which was the opinion of Heracleitus, Xenophanes, Pythagoras and Plato; or allegorising *interpreters*, such as Anaxagoras,

Metrodorus of Lampsacus, and Democritus, the last being the author of the earliest Homeric *glossary*. The Homeric style and language of Plato, and his constant citation of the author whom he banishes from his *Republic*, has excited much attention from critics. It would almost seem that Aristarchus had Plato's very copy of Homer before him, so accurately do Plato's citations agree with the final Alexandrian text. Antisthenes the Cynic, whose style and tastes were by no means so poetical, wrote a number of tracts on special Homeric points, and indeed Plato's attack on Homer gave rise to a controversial literature.¹ The special studies of the Stoics, Cleanthes and Chrysippus, were developed by the school of Pergamus, which adopted their views. Aristotle's studies on Homer, which were various, led the way for a whole series of Peripatetic commentators.

4. I will but add a word on the *Sophists*, who constantly used Homeric subjects for declamation, and from whom we still possess *Encomia of Helen*; there are also allusions to Apologies for Paris, *Encomia on Polyphemus*, and other paradoxes.

5. Among the *orators*, Demosthenes, like every great Greek writer, is said to have imitated Homer, but we see less Homeric influence in his than in Lycurgus' and Æschines' speeches, both of whom cite passages, though with considerable variants, from our texts. Dion and Plutarch appeal to him as an inspired authority on most matters. This mere skeleton of the facts shows how constant and familiar was the reading of Homer in classical days. We might as well attempt to enumerate the biblical phrases and influences in our own standard English authors.

§ 28. Such were the preliminary studies on Homer when he passed into the hands of Zenodotus at Alexandria. While he found many city editions, and private texts representing recensions like that of Rhianus,² as well as many additional essays or problems, such as those of Antimachus or Aristotle,

¹ Cf. the titles cited by Sengebusch, *Diss. Hom. prior*, p. 119.

² It may be inferred that critics of this period, and even Apollonius Rhodius and Aratus, of Alexandrian days, were very reckless in correcting the text. Timon the Sillograph is said to have told Aratus, when the latter asked his advice to procure a good text, that he would do so, εἰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις ἐντυγχάνοι, καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἤδη διωρθωμένοις (Diog. Laert. ix. 12, 6).

we can hardly say that much thorough criticism had been done before his day. The grammatical or philological side was probably quite obscured by the philosophical and moral, and lines or books were rejected rather as being unworthy of the great poet than as violating epic usage or the traditions of the old epic dialect. For we must remember that Homer, especially after the rejection of the inferior works once attributed to him, became literally the Bible of the Greeks. All religion and philosophy were supposed to be contained in his poems, and of course, when men were determined to find these things, they easily found them. As Seneca tells us, some made him a Stoic, some a Peripatetic, some an Epicurean, some even discovered him¹ to be the father of the Sceptics. Nevertheless the good homely orthodox Greeks of earlier days had attached all their moral teaching of youth to the examples and advices given in the Iliad and Odyssey.

A good deal of adverse criticism had been expended upon this way of looking at Homer by Plato, in the wake of Heraclitus, Xenophanes, and others; but of these Zoilus, a rhetorician of the fourth century B.C., the pupil of Socrates and said to be a teacher of Demosthenes, has gained the chief notoriety. This was because he did not recognise, like Plato, the poetic excellence of the poems, but attacked them æsthetically and even grammatically, as well as morally. He wrote nine books against Homer. His name might probably have been forgotten, but for the fancy of some Roman emperors, such as Caligula and afterwards Hadrian, for depreciating Homer. Of course they revived and favoured whatever adverse criticism could be discovered. But it may fairly be said that, except the work of Zoilus, which was probably more a rhetorical exercise than a serious attempt to destroy Homer's influence,² all the criticism which was handed down to the school of Alexandria was rather troublesome from its consistent panegyric, and even superstitious reverence for Homer, than instructive from its severity or justice.

¹ Diog. Laert. ix. 71.

² γυμνασίᾳ ἔνεκα, εἰσόδων καὶ τῶν ρητόρων ἐν τοῖς ποιηταῖς γυμνάζεσθαι (Schol. K. 274). Cf. also Suidas on Daphidas, punished by Attalus I. for having insulted the memory of Homer.

§ 29. It seems that the Alexandrian critics, when they came to sift all these materials, and were unable to reach back even so far as Peisistratus, laid most stress on the *old editions*, of which seven city editions were then extant,¹ and seven *κατ' ἀνδρα*, or recensions by individual scholars, which had been prepared from the recension of Onomacritus. It would be most interesting to know at what exact time during the present period these copies were taken. Seeing that epical recitation went out of fashion when lyric and dramatic poetry was developed, and seeing that these copies were thought older and better than those of the earliest critics, they cannot have been later than the middle of the fifth century B.C., and possibly somewhat earlier.

§ 30. When we speak of the Alexandrian critics we almost exclude the dilettanti, such as Philetas, Aratus, Apollonius, &c., and confine ourselves strictly to the grammarians, who brought the accumulated treasures of the great library to bear upon the study of the text of Homer. It may indeed be said that all philology among the Greeks, all textual and grammatical criticism, arose from the desire to purify and to understand the text of Homer, and then of other old poets.

The glories of the great school of Alexandria cluster about three names—the successive leaders of the school, the two latter each rivalling and opposing his master. Zenodotus² was the first who rejected as spurious all but the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and

¹ An edition in those days meant a single official copy, preserved by authority, from which private copies were made. The civic editions were the Massaliotic, Sinopic, Chian, Cyprian, Argive, Cretan, and Æolic (Lesbian). The four first were Ionic, the rest Æolic. The Massaliotic is far most frequently quoted (twenty-nine times), the Chian next (fifteen times). The Æolic editions seem to have been specially intended to preserve the Ionic dialect of the poems among an Æolic population. The quotations from these do not give us a very high idea of them, nor, indeed, were the private editions much better, that of Antimachus being noted for wild conjectures. Nevertheless, Aristarchus seems never to have opposed them, when they all agreed (cf. Sengebusch, *Diss. Hom. prior*, 185–200).

² He was an Ephesian, and flourished 300–250 B.C. The second Ptolemy made him librarian at Alexandria, and he undertook the task of critically revising the epic and lyric poets.

undertook a thorough revision of the text, which attained such a reputation that it soon obscured all others. We unfortunately know hardly anything of his work, and what we know is from the criticisms of his successors.¹ It seems probable that he had before him no sufficient materials, or sufficient preliminary discussion, to afford a really clear and scientific method of establishing the text. He therefore was guided partly by æsthetical and moral considerations, partly by a love of archaisms and rare forms. He seems to have laid special stress on Ionic forms, if we may judge from the occasional references to him in the scholia. But he rejected and altered with great boldness, and so incurred the grave censure of his successors.

Before proceeding further we may notice that one of his pupils, Hellanicus, revived the doctrine of an unknown Xenon, and asserted the separate authorship of the Odyssey. This was the natural and logical outcome of the criticism which had adjudicated the Cyclic poems successively, and we may well wonder that this final step had not been taken long before. Hellanicus appears to have had a following—the *χωρίζοντες* (*Separatists*), and their view might have prevailed but for the determined hostility of Aristarchus, who crushed it completely till the present century. It is now accepted by the majority of critics.

§ 31. The famous successor and pupil of Zenodotus, Aristophanes (of Byzantium), re-edited Homer from a more conservative as well as critical point of view. Here again we can only speak from the hints left us by the criticisms of Aristarchus. He checked the boldness of Zenodotus in rejections and alterations, and based his labours on a careful comparative study of all the best texts, especially the city texts, which were then being acquired for the Alexandrian library. Though

¹ His critical edition first separated the poems into books, noted by the letters of the alphabet. He first used the obelus, to distinguish suspicious lines, whereas the manifestly spurious were ejected. These proceedings are respectively called *ἀθέτησις* and *τὸ οὐδὲ γράφειν*. He also published a glossary of obscure Homeric words, and a computation of the days of the action of the poems, of which a fragment is published by Lachmann (*Betrachtungen*, p. 90).

defended by his pupil Callistratus against the attacks of Aristarchus, he did not maintain his ground, and we must deeply regret that the labours of so careful and candid a writer have been almost totally lost to us.¹ Thirdly comes Aristarchus, a sort of king or infallible guide to later grammarians, whose opinions were adopted by the scholiasts even when they were aware, as they tell us, that Zenodotus or Aristophanes appeared more reasonable.

§ 32. Aristarchus was not only a remarkable critical scholar, but must have been a man of strong and commanding personality, that swayed all those who came in contact with him. He again edited the Homeric poems as well as the principal lyric and dramatic authors, and besides these editions published commentaries (*ὑπομνήματα*) and dissertations (*συγγράμματα*). Moreover, his oral lectures were attended by a crowd of eager hearers. Thus even the unwritten opinions of Aristarchus, taken down by his numerous pupils, became widely known. He analysed carefully the epic use of words and phrases as well as the epic forms of the myths, and based most of his rejections from the text on the violation of these criteria. He indicated his opinions by a famous series of critical marks, which are preserved to us in the old Marcian MS. at Venice.²

¹ He rejected the end of the *Odyssey* from ψ 297, and used the stigma and antisigma, as well as the *κεράνιον*, T, to mark a spurious passage, whereas Aristarchus preferred to append an obelus to each line. But his glossary seems to have been of peculiar value, and he seems also to have composed a formal commentary on Homer.

² They were as follows : (1) Zenodotus' *obelus*, —, a sign universally accepted from the terrible grammarian as a mark of spuriousness, and commonly to be found in the margin of German texts now-a-days. (2) Leogoras' *diple*, ϝ (called *διπλῇ καθαρῇ*, or *ἀπερίστικτος*), used rather for exposition, or to show a line which told against the Separatists, or an *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*, or an Attic construction ; in Aristarchus' second edition it seems to have called attention to the notes of the earlier editions. (3) The *dotted* (*περιστιγμένη*) *diple*, ϝ̣, to denote the variants from the edition of Zenodotus, and afterwards from that of Crates also. (4) The *asterisk*, ϝ̣̣, to mark the genuine verses, in case of repetitions, whereas the rejected duplicates were marked with both asterisk and obelus. (5) The *antisigma* and the *stigma*, ϝ̣ and ϝ̣̣, were used to mark repetitions of the same idea. It seems that Aristarchus' earlier edition was accompanied by

There is great difference of opinion as to the real merits of Aristarchus. Some of the Germans are disposed to submit to his authority absolutely. Others think he was a pretentious and shallow critic, if not an impostor. As he has simply superseded all the older texts, so that all we know of Homer, saving stray quotations, comes from his recension, we have not sufficient materials to judge him.¹ The extreme arrogance of the man and his absolute dogmatism do not dispose us to rate him very highly; and though he certainly surpassed most men in real grammatical knowledge and familiarity with epic diction, it is to be feared that he was often led by traditional reasons, and even by mere caprice, in default of, or in opposition to, solid grounds. On one question certainly he seems to me to have shown great prejudice—his rejection of the Separatist theory. He based this, we are told, on no more sustainable argument than supposed anticipations of the Odyssey which he found in the Iliad, as well as on the admitted discrepancies within the Iliad itself, and on these points he wrote a special treatise.

All three critics were too straitly bound by tradition to venture on the theory of large interpolations in the text, if we except the sound judgment of Aristophanes, that the end of the Odyssey from ψ 297 was added by another hand. They contented themselves with frequent rejection of what they considered spurious lines—in all 1160 were thus rejected—and this is commonly called *athetising* (*ἀθετεῖν*). Constant reference to Aristarchus's opinion is preserved in the Venetian scholia on the Iliad.

a commentary, but that the second was not so, the critical marks referring to his own and others' commentaries. His special essays were probably appended, or to be read in relation, to the later text. All these matters are subject to doubt, and are inferred from hints in the scholia and lexicæ. Lehrs' book *De Studiis Hom. Aristarchi*, and now Ludwig's ed. (1885) as well as Sengebusch's *First Homeric Dissertation*, may be consulted for full and learned details. On the critical signs, the best book is now Gardthausen's *Paläographie*, p. 288 (Leipzig, 1879).

¹ A fragment from the Petrie papyri, which was written before his time and contains the ends and beginnings of the lines Λ 503–37, shows that there were five lines within that compass, not now in our text. The details are given in my 'Cunningham Memoir,' published by the *Royal Irish Academy* (cf. Plate III. and the Commentary thereon).

§ 33. But whatever faults we may attribute to Aristarchus, his criticism seems sober and practical beside that of Crates, who founded the rival school of Pergamum, and who, under the influence of Stoic philosophy, endeavoured to thrust in allegory where Aristarchus would only allow ordinary interpretation. Still the establishment of a rival school, with its controversies, is a fortunate circumstance, since it has preserved for us in our scholia sundry notes, and allusions to Aristarchus' opponents, which had else been lost. It is also to the treasures of this school that the Alexandrian scholars owed the replacement of some of their MSS., when the fire of 47 B.C. destroyed the authentic copies of their great recensions—a loss, however, but ill compensated by transfers from the Pergamene library.

It would require a long and tedious enumeration to give an account of the various grammarians who carried on the work of the great masters. I will mention but a few leading names. Demetrius of Scepsis discussed with prejudiced acuteness the geography in the Iliad, and especially of the Troad. It is to Didymus' book on Aristarchus' recension that we owe much of our knowledge of Aristarchus' work. The fragments of Didymus are carefully collected by Ludwig, *Arist. Hom. Text-Kritik*, pp. 174–620. Aristonicus, about the same time, explained the marks of Aristarchus, which were evidently becoming ill-understood. Nicanor on the punctuation of Homer (Hadrian's time), and Herodian on his prosody and accents (M. Aurelius), are well spoken of, though the fashion in Hadrian's day was to slight and even to revile Homer. From a compendium of these four works, Herodian's *Homeric prosody*, Nicanor on *Homeric punctuation*, Didymus' account of Aristarchus' *recension*, and Aristonicus' *critical marks*, is drawn the best body of scholia found in the Marcian codex A at Venice, and excerpted in inferior MSS. At the end of the second century A.D., independent criticism, if we except Porphyry's, ceased, and people began to make compendiums and excerpts of previous works. Porphyry seems to have gone carefully into the artistic merits of the poems, but on the somewhat absurd ground that they were to be treated as trage-

dies. Hence he applied to them the laws laid down in Aristotle's *Poetic* concerning that kind of poetry.¹ A mere compilation from various works, ascribed by Eustathius to Apion, is still extant, though in a bad and incomplete condition.

§ 34. This review has brought us down to the verge of the dark ages. If we ask what the actual materials are which modern scholars can use in reconstructing the texts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, we must separate these materials into commentaries, scholia, and texts. Our oldest and best *commentary* is that of Eustathius, Archbishop of Thessalonica, who wrote in the end of the twelfth century in Constantinople a careful Greek commentary on both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. He used not only the same sources as the extant scholia, but had access to many others since lost, and his book is valuable, though he adopted the allegorical interpretation of the Stoics and the Pergamene school, in preference to the Alexandrian. We have besides the beginning of Tzetzes' commentary on the *Iliad*, Manuel Moschopoulos on the first two books of the *Iliad*, and a prose paraphrase. A little Homeric lexicon by Apollonius has survived,² and there are explanations of Homeric words and phrases in the dictionaries of Hesychius and Suidas.

We now come to the *scholia*. These are short notes (*ὑπομνήματα*) added in the margin of our MSS., and are the work of different hands and ages. They are meant for commentaries on the text. It may fairly be said that some authors, such as Homer and Aristophanes, would be often unintelligible but for these explanations, which were added at a time when the learning of Alexandria yet survived, at least in excerpts and compendia. We must separate here for the first time the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as the value of the scholia of the former is far superior to that of the latter. For a

¹ Cf. the curious details brought together on this question in Trendelenburg's *Gram. Græc. de arte trag. judiciorum Reliqq.*, p. 73, sqq. He shows that the quotations from Porphyry are contained in the scholia on the exterior margin of the cod. Ven. B, while those of the interior margin are mere compendia of these and of the far better scholia of cod. A.

² Edited by Villoison (Paris, 1768), and again by Tollius (Leyden, 1788). We have now an Ed. of Porphyry on the *Iliad* by Schrader (Leipzig, 1880).

long time, indeed, the only scholia known on the Iliad were those called *brevia* or Didymic scholia, which were taken from various fourteenth-century MSS. and first printed by Lascaris (Rome, 1517), and then more completely with those of the Odyssey by Aldus (1521-8). These notes seem merely such as might be of service in school teaching, and are very short and simple.

The discovery of the Marcian codex of the Iliad at Venice, by Villoison, and the publication of its text and scholia (Venice, 1778), known as Schol. Ven. A, form an epoch in the history of Homeric studies. It is from these notes that we derive all our information about the several old editions used or produced by the Alexandrian critics. The text is also furnished with the critical marks (*σημειώσεις*) of Aristarchus and his pupils, which are explained in a prefatory note.¹

The best edition of the Venetian scholia A, together with the scholia B, which are not unique, but of the same origin as the Townleiana (Brit. Mus.), Lipsiensia, Leidensia, and Mosquensia, was till lately Bekker's (Berlin, 1825). We have at last from Cobet and D. B. Monro, collating for Dindorf (Oxon. 1877), a thoroughly critical and, I suppose, final revision of the text. La Roche and C. Wachsmuth have written short essays on the critical marks of the margin, and the value of the whole collection has been sifted in the essays of Sengebusch and Lehrs.²

It is probable that there was a copy of the Odyssey corresponding to the old Marcian Iliad at Venice also; but all efforts to find it have been in vain. Apart from the scholia *brevia*, which extend to the Odyssey, and which were long since

¹ Villoison's text, and his Prolegomena, though perpetually referred to, are now seldom read. As most academic libraries contain the book, a fresh perusal of this great monument of diligence and learning may be strongly recommended. The style of the Prolegomena is very ponderous, and the author is perpetually digressing into all manner of collateral subjects; but he is always instructive. The account of the dangers he incurred in his voyage from Upsala to Venice, and of his stay there, is very amusing, and almost rivals the famous enumeration of persecutions by S. Paul.

² The most complete book is now Ludwich's (*Aristarch's Hom. Text-Kritik*, 1885), who fully describes the Cod. Ven. A, pp. 89 sqq.

known, Cardinal Mai published, from the Ambrosian Library at Milan, older and fuller scholia, which, with some additions from Palatine and a Harleian MS., were first edited by Buttmann (1821), and now, as fully and completely as the materials will allow, by G. Dindorf (Oxon. 1855).

§ 35. As to the condition of our *texts*, it seems that the early mediæval grammarians contented themselves with critical notes and commentaries, and were not desirous to revise, so that what has come down to us is a sort of eclectic vulgar text, with a general adherence to Aristarchus, but fortunately giving a good many readings from previous editors. We have, indeed, interesting remains of an older date. In Egypt three fragments on papyrus were found, dating not later than the first century after Christ, and probably earlier. They contain part of Ω and part of Σ . There is among the papyri of the Louvre a similar fragment of N found at Elephantine.¹ These very early texts offer only blundering variations from our mediæval MSS., and thus supply a strong argument in favour of the general trustworthiness of the transmission of our Greek classics. Next in age come fifty-eight pages of very curious pictures from an old copy of the fifth or sixth century, containing on the back of each picture fragments of the poem in capital letters, very like in character to the oldest New Testament MSS. These pictures, together with the *tabula Iliaca*, the Odyssey scenes of the Vatican (published by Karl Woermann), and some Pompeian frescoes, show how widely illustrations of the Homeric poems were circulated. The pictures of the Ambrosian codex (published by A. Mai, Milan, 1819), are very remarkable, as being perhaps the last really *classical* pictures before the advent of the lower mediæval type. The text offers no variance of importance in the 800 lines it contains; it was merely added by way of explaining the pictures. Next in age is the Syriac palimpsest edited by Cureton (London, 1851), containing several thousand verses. All these fragments are greatly inferior in critical value to the Marcian codex A in Venice, which dates from the eleventh century, but is one of

¹ Mr. Petrie has since found the end of A and most of B under the head of a mummy at Hawara (now in the Ashmolean Museum).

the most precious and carefully prepared in all the range of our Greek classics. The Townley and Harleian seem to rank next in value. From the fourteenth century we possess a great many inferior MSS., which have no independent value.

§ 36. *Bibliographical.* The *editio princeps* of Chalcondylas (Florence, 1488) is a very splendid book, containing the lesser works attributed to Homer as well as the Iliad and Odyssey. It is produced in a type unfortunately abandoned since Aldus began to print,¹ and is now one of the rare ornaments of a few great libraries. The two Aldine editions which follow (Venice, 1504, 1517) are not to be named in comparison with it. Except the first attempt at a commentary by Camerarius, there is no edition of note till the very fine *Heroic Poets of Greece* of Stephanus (1554). Passing by Schrevelius' edition, with scholia and indices (Amsterdam, 1655), we come to Josh. Barnes (1711) and S. Clarke (1724-40), with good notes, and then to Vil-loison's learned and valuable Iliad from the Marcian codex (1788). Wolf (1794), Heyne (1802-22), and Porson (1800) were the most noted editors at the opening of this century. In our own day the text has been further analysed and fixed by the labours of Bekker (1858), La Roche, and Dindorf. The best annotated editions are, in German, those of La Roche, Faesi, Ameis and Düntzer; in English, Leaf's Iliad,² Hayman's and Merry's Odyssey—Nitzsch's elaborate commentary on the first twelve books of the latter had led the way (1826-40)—in French, A. Pierron's Iliad (Hachette), with a translation of Wolf's *Prolegomena*, and good notes. Ebeling's elaborate, and at last finished, *Lexicon Homericum* is full of materials; Autenrieth's is shorter, and a mere handbook. The very complete *Indices* of Seber (1604), reprinted with Clark's Ed. (Oxon.,

¹ The earlier Greek types were on the model of the older and finer MSS. of the tenth and eleventh centuries. Aldus unfortunately took the fourteenth century writing as his model, and so permanently injured Greek printing.

² Since this was printed Mr. D. B. Monro has published a very elaborate and valuable *Homeric Grammar* (2nd. ed. 1891), as well as short commentaries on early books of the Iliad, and Mr. W. Leaf has brought out a full and satisfactory commentary, a great boon to the world of Hellenists. Christ's critical edition (1884) is the most recent.

1780), and Mr. Prendergast (*Iliad* only), also deserve mention. Commentaries and special tracts on portions of the poems are a library in themselves.

Translations into all manner of tongues, and in every variety of style, are even still pouring from the press, though every generation since the Revival of learning has been supplying them. The literature of these translations has become a special study, as may be seen from Bernays' *Bonn Programm* (1850) on the early Latin ones, and Penon's *Versiones Homeri Anglicæ inter se comparatæ* (Bonn, 1861), in German, W. Henkel on the English, and W. Müller on the German versions; and Mr. Arnold's Oxford Lectures on translating *Homer* (Longman, 1861). As has been well said by the last, and, perhaps, best translators of the *Odyssey*, Messrs. Butcher and Lang (1879), every age has its own way of looking at these immortal epics. Chapman satisfied the Elizabethan age, while Pope breathed the spirit of Queen Anne's period into his version; so that these poems, though permanent English works, are translations 'from a lost point of view.'¹ Hence we may expect no version to be final, and so long as Greek letters are studied, and the great poems of Homer read, countless hands will repeat the same fascinating, but never ultimately satisfying experiment. The *Faust* of Goethe, which already can boast of forty English versions, and the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, seem to possess the same curious and distinctive feature of the highest productions of human genius. I will only specify a few of the successive attempts.

The barbarous version of the *Odyssey* into Saturnian verse by Livius Andronicus, in the days of the first Punic war, stood alone in its antiquity. It was long a Roman school-book, though the style shocked literary men of succeeding generations, and, if extant, would be a curious and interesting relic of early Roman education.

After the Revival of letters there were several Latin and hexameter versions, from Valla's (1474) to Cunichius' (1776), in Italy. The Dutch produced a metrical *Odyssey* by Coornhorst (1593), then Van Manders' *Iliad* (1611), a whole prose

¹ Cf. also Arnold, *op. cit.* p. 29.

Homer (1658), and sundry other attempts, ending with the recent hexameter poem of C. Vosmaer. The French, besides older and now little known versions, have Madame Dacier's (1711) and many others in the present century, ending with some remarkable prose translations. The Germans contribute Voss, Donner, and A. Jacob. England has been the most prolific, owing to a longer and more thorough study of Greek. First comes Chapman, then Thos. Hobbes, Pope, MacPherson's prose Iliad, then Cowper. In our own day it is almost hazardous to assert that any scholar has not, at least in part, translated Homer. The catalogue of those which occur in any library is indeed curious. If we include short pieces, Tennyson and Gladstone may be added to F. W. Newman, Lord Derby, Sir J. Herschel, Dean Merivale, J. S. Blackie, Worsley, Wright, Musgrave, Brandreth, and many others. The Odyssey of Messrs. S. H. Butcher and A. Lang, and the Iliad of Messrs. Lang and Leaf, deserve special note as a remarkable attempt to render Homer into antique prose. Even the modern Greeks are now producing paraphrases in their language, of which two (Christopoulos' and Loukanis', both Paris, 1870) are cited as of merit.

The reader who has looked through this mere skeleton list will doubtless excuse me from attempting the task of criticising or comparing these myriad reproductions.

Having thus traced the external history of the preservation of the poems down to our own day, we shall proceed to a brief sketch of the Homeric controversy in modern times as based upon the materials set forth in this chapter.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE HOMERIC CONTROVERSY FROM THE REVIVAL
OF LEARNING TO THE PRESENT DAY.

§ 37. AFTER the discovery of printing, and the dissemination of copies through Europe, the history of the poems concerns itself no longer with their preservation, now assured, but rather with their general reputation and the criticism of their composition. The scholars of the Renaissance could not but revere the man whom they found celebrated in all Greek literature as by far the first and greatest of poets; but owing partly to the better knowledge they possessed of Latin, partly to the influence of Dante, partly to the artificial nature of their culture and their ignorance of spontaneous art, Homer was not greater in their eyes than Virgil—nay rather with many decidedly inferior. He was praised as the rival and fellow of Virgil, but not studied with any real care. Voltaire, indeed, seems to have appreciated the perfection of the details of the *Iliad* as compared with its deficiency in plot; and still earlier, Vico had made some bold and curious guesses about the mythical character of Homer himself as the ideal representative of Greek epic poetry, and had been followed by Zoega and Wood. But these isolated judgments are of no importance.

§ 38. The first move in modern Homeric criticism was the discovery and publication of the older Venetian scholia by Villoison. The second and greatest was the *Prolegomena* of F. A. Wolf (1795), based upon this discovery; for the scholia showed plainly the doubts and difficulties of the Alexandrian editors, who were obliged to accept and reject passages, not on the authority of well-authenticated manuscripts, but according to laws of criticism established among themselves, and based on taste, and on

minute study of epic diction. It was plain that the manuscripts which we possess represent nothing older or purer than the Alexandrian texts, it was equally plain that the Alexandrians had before them no text approaching the age of the composition of the poems. Their best authorities were the *city* copies, which were posterior to the age of Peisistratus, and none of them written in the older alphabet. As for Peisistratus' copy, not only had it disappeared (possibly in the Persian destruction of Athens), but there was no *city* copy professing to represent it better than the rest.

Accordingly, Wolf held that we had no evidence for the writing down of the poems earlier than the commission of Peisistratus. He showed that the writing down of these long poems required not merely knowledge, but expertness in writing, and presupposed a reading public to take advantage of it.¹ This was not the condition of early poetry in Greece, as may be seen from the brief and fragmentary remains of early hymns and of Hesiodic teaching. The poetry of the nation was rather that of wandering rhapsodes, who composed short poems for special occasions, and trusted to a well-trained memory and to a traditional style for their preservation. In the days of Wolf there was a strong reaction in taste from learned and artificial composition to folk-song and primitive simplicity. Hence the rhapsodes were to him no mere repeaters or preservers of Homer, but gifted natural poets, each pouring out his pure and fresh utterance to a simple and receptive audience. The shortness and independence of these several rhapsodies were proved, in Wolf's mind, by the many discrepancies and contradictions which a careful examination could show in the *Iliad*. He would not, in fact, admit in it any conscious or deliberate plan of composition.

From these premises he drew the conclusion that one Homer could not be the author of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*,

¹ To this last statement I demur. A listening public, with a taste for poetry, is quite sufficient, provided there exist a literary class who can use writing in the composition of their works. Cf. my arguments on the question in *Macmillan's Magazine* for February and April, 1879, in answer to Mr. Paley.

but that our Iliad in particular is a mere aggregate of materials, which were accumulating for generations, until the artists of an advanced literary epoch took it in hand to combine and set in order these scattered fragments. This redaction removed many traces of suture and of discrepancy, but left a large number, and especially the conclusions of both poems, which had been suspected and condemned even at Alexandria. Peisistratus completed the work by authentic written copies and orderly recitations. Homer, then, was merely the symbol of this long, secret, national activity among the Ionians, and does not represent an individual genius.

No work on Greek philology ever created such a stir in the world as this short book. All the German poets, philosophers, and critics discussed it. Schiller, on æsthetic grounds, declared it barbarous. Goethe wavered, and having adopted it in his youth recanted in old age. W. von Humboldt declared his assent; and Fichte even pronounced it, in truly German style, to be a conclusion he had himself attained metaphysically and *à priori*. On the whole, with the aid of Niebuhr, the two Schlegels, and G. Hermann, the new theory may be said to have taken Germany by storm. Nothing independent was done, either in France or England, on this question till the nations had settled down after their great war.

§ 39. The Germans consider G. Hermann as the principal writer on the subject in the period following upon Wolf's; but his theories are not so much based on historical data as on probable assumptions; and have therefore been without lasting effect. His main merit was to see the great difficulties in parts of Wolf's theory, and the necessity of not resting content with his book as if it were a Homeric gospel. He pointed to the absurdity of the Homeric bards confining themselves to so small a portion, not only of Greek legend, but even of the Trojan war; then the apparent sudden silence of all these bards in the period between the composition of Homer and that of the Cyclic poems, which were decidedly later; lastly, he pointed to the universal feeling of the unity and excellence of the Iliad and Odyssey as based on the interest and excellence of their matter, rather than on exceptional treatment.

Hence he assumed, what is probable enough, that the didactic epic poetry, like that of Hesiod, is really older in Greek literature ; that Homer was the first bard who struck out a new path, and created a school of imitators and rivals who confined themselves, as he had done, to a small portion of the existing legends. Hermann assumed no pre-Homeric materials in Homer, but supposed him to be a great and original genius whose work, as we have it, is enlarged and deformed by long and disturbing interpolations. He thought the same poet had composed a short Iliad and Odyssey, and that these were the basis of the succeeding poems. But he confessed himself unable to explain the gap or silence in epic poetry from the old Homer to the later Cyclic poems.

The point in favour of this theory, as compared with Wolf's, is that the general plan in the poems is regarded as not the accidental result of their aggregation, but an original outline sketched by a master hand, and gradually filled in by expanding episodes.

§ 40. On the other hand, Lachmann was led by Wolf's work to apply similar reasonings to the old German epic, the *Nibelungen-lied*, which he examined for the purpose of discovering its claim to unity in the relation of its component parts. The result of this comparative study was a more advanced and thorough-going scepticism concerning the unity of the Iliad. He denies, indeed, that the Iliad is a mere aggregate of rudely joined poems without any deliberately composed transitions ; but, nevertheless, he believes that he has found so many inconsistencies and contradictions that he distinctly asserts the plan of the Iliad to be the afterthought of a clever arranger, and not an original feature in the poem.

The views of Hermann and Lachmann may be said to comprise under them all the various theories, or modifications of theories, with which the classical press of Germany is teeming, and which have caused angry controversies.

§ 41. No notable German scholar of the present day ventures to hold the substantial unity and purity of either the Iliad or Odyssey in the sense received at Alexandria, and still not

unfrequent in England. The so-called advocates of the unity of the *Iliad*—Nitzsch, Bernhardt, Bergk, and a few others—advocate it in a sense which would astonish any ancient critic, or any modern enthusiast for a single Homer. Instead of obelising here and there a line, or pair of lines, as Zenodotus and Aristarchus had done—a proceeding which, with all the old critics together, only affected some 1160 lines in the two poems—these defenders of the unity of the *Iliad* reject books, and parts of books, with a readiness which almost destroys their own argument. It is, in fact, no more than the theory of Hermann, that there was a short, simple nucleus, enlarged and injured by great and often inconsistent additions.

Thus Bergk, the latest of them, rehandles the *Iliad* in a manner more arbitrary than has been done by advanced advocates of the theory of aggregation. He assumes that the original Homer, a personage of stern and grand temper, living in the tenth century B.C., composed a short, simple epic of such merit that all additions can be detected by their style. Then there are the imitators, of undetermined number, one of whom certainly possessed much grace and elegance, and was a true poet, though far removed from the grandeur of the real Homer. These have composed the famous dialogue of Priam and Helen on the walls, the parting of Hector and Andromache, the funeral games, and the ransoming of Hector—all unworthy of the stern original poet. It verily requires some assurance to assert that in a great literary artist sternness and tenderness are inconsistent, and to found upon it a difference of authorship ! But this is not all.

In addition to the real Homer, and the gifted but weaker imitators, comes the 'impertinent diaskeuast,' who re-arranged, altered, and greatly injured the poems in reducing them to their present form. To this man he attributes all passages in which the Cretan chiefs, Idomeneus and Meriones, appear on the scene. The diaskeuast had probably been hospitably treated in Crete, was very fond of eating and drinking; and so he glorifies Lemnos for its wine and Crete for its valour. He also inserted all the eating and drinking scenes which are so prominent in the *Iliad*, besides many other narratives, or parts of

narratives, which are in Bergk's judgment flippant and vapid in tone, though good literary judges have read and admired them without any suspicion of such late and unworthy origin.

§ 42. Nothing can prove more completely how the views of Wolf and Lachmann have affected even their bitterest adversaries in Germany. There is, in fact, no writer of any note for the last generation in that country who has ventured to uphold the real unity of the *Iliad* even in the most modest way. On the other hand, the professed followers of Lachmann are numerous, and loud in proclaiming their victory. His attempt to separate part of the *Iliad* into the original songs of which it was composed has been followed up by Köchly—who has also published an *Iliad* in sixteen or seventeen separate songs—by Lehrs, by Bonitz, and by many others. They differ, as I have said, from the pretended advocates of unity, by denying that there is any plan in the patchwork of the *Iliad* beyond what was brought into it by the commission of Peisistratus. Lachmann even declares such a notion ridiculous. Bonitz thinks that all the world's admiration is really produced by the excellence of the details, and that this feeling is fallaciously transferred to the plot, which has no such merit.

All these critics have fixed their attention so firmly on discrepancies, they are so outraged by inconsistencies of the most trifling sort, by mistakes in the names of heroes, by the re-appearance of slain heroes, by the inaccuracies of chronology in the action, that they have lost all appreciation for the large unity of plan which has conquered and fascinated the literary world for more than twenty centuries.¹

§ 43. Thus the controversy about the *Iliad* has narrowed itself in Germany to a very definite issue. All critics allow that there is considerable patchwork in the poem, that but a small part of it comes from a single author, that there are evidences of the incorporation of various independent lays. There is, of course, great diversity of opinion among these subtle and dogmatic sceptics concerning the merit of the

¹ The literature since 1882 seems to show a reaction in favour of a certain kind of unity. This is so especially in Sittl's *L.G.* i. pp. 74, sq.

individual pieces and their fitness for their place. What one considers splendid old poetry the next considers foolish and vapid ; what one holds to be so out of place as to prove manifest patchwork, the next proves necessary to the march of the action. Yet upon many passages they are agreed, and have brought in a verdict of incongruity. The great question still at issue is this : Were these separate poems brought together before the plot or after it ? Were they connected by a poet who conceived a large plan, and who desired to produce a great work on the wrath of Achilles, or were they a mere aggregate brought together for the sake of preserving and publishing old and beautiful lays, which by their mere cohesion formed a sort of loose irregular plot, and by their several excellence imposed a belief in their unity upon an uncritical age ?

§ 44. While this has been the general course of the Homeric question as regards the *Iliad* in Germany, scholarship in England has followed quite a different and isolated path. I will not say that our English writers on the Homeric question are ignorant of the labours of the Germans, especially of the earlier labours, which are for the most part written in Latin. On the contrary, some of them—as, for instance, Mure—show a very wide acquaintance with this literature. But I cannot help thinking that none of them, except Grote, has been familiar with German philology from his youth. They have read the Germans for the sake of the controversy, and when their minds were made up ; so that both Colonel Mure and Mr. Gladstone study the Germans in order to refute them, while Mr. Paley is so carried away by their arguments that he outruns even their wildest scepticism.

§ 45. I will give a very brief sketch of the principal points in the English history of this controversy. The arguments of Wolf had their effect upon Payne Knight, whose *Prolegomena* to his curious edition (with the digamma introduced), while asserting very conservative views as to interpolations or aggregation of parts in the *Iliad*, advocated the separate origin of the two poems. He urged the usual grounds for a difference of authorship—differences of language, of mythology, and of general treatment—sustaining them with profound learning

and great acuteness. This theory was submitted to an elaborate examination and refutation by Colonel Mure, in his very erudite *History of Greek Literature*—a book which has not received a tithe of the attention it deserved, and which the German writers on the subject pass over with a single sentence, as a retrograde British work a generation behind the attitude of Wolf.

Mure is, indeed, the most determined advocate of the unity of authorship of the whole *Iliad* and the whole *Odyssey*. He will hardly allow even the *ψυχαγωγία* of the last book in the *Odyssey* to be interpolated, and will only submit to the obelus of Aristarchus where there is authority for it in the old editions—not where the æsthetical taste of the Alexandrian school was offended. But he holds this view with his eyes open, and after a careful perusal of all that the Germans up to his day had written upon the subject. Moreover, he makes good the great standpoint of English criticism as opposed to them: it is the principle that a large quantity of inconsistencies, and even contradictions, are perfectly compatible with single authorship.

This principle has been further worked out by Mr. Gladstone,¹ who has added many illustrations and much ingenious pleading to the position of Mure. He, too, holds the personality of Homer, his historical reality, and that both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are the offspring of his genius. He has exhausted his great ability in showing, as Mure had before done, delicate touches of character consistently applied to the same individuals all through the poems. It is well known that Aristarchus refuted the Separatists by a tract proving anticipations of the *Odyssey* in the *Iliad*. This argument has not been pressed of late years; but every casual conformity is urged as a proof of unity, while all inconsistencies and difficulties are explained as the natural imperfections of a long work composed without writing, in an uncritical age, and addressed to uncritical hearers. The beauty and perfection of the suspected books of the *Iliad* (I, Ω, and others) are cited as proving their genuineness; it is assumed that no

¹ *Homer and the Homeric Age* (3 vols., 1858); *Iuventus Mundi* (1869), and in many articles in the *Contemporary* and *Nineteenth Century*.

number of different poets could possibly be so excellent. Even the Alexandrian rejection of the conclusions of both poems is disallowed. In fact, the attitude of Mure and Mr. Gladstone is not only behind Wolf, it is distinctly behind Aristarchus and Zenodotus. There is, I think, no other question in Greek literature where England and Germany appear to me to have travelled so long on such different lines ; nor do I know any controversy where the attitude of the two nations is more separate and isolated, in spite of numerous quotations from one another's writings.

§ 46. But while these respectable scholars were advocating the vulgar beliefs of an uncritical age, Mr. Grote, with a complete study, and, still more, with a thorough appreciation of German philology, matured his great chapter¹ on the Homeric poems, which contains (in my opinion) more good sense and sound criticism than all else that has been written on the subject either in England or Germany ; for, in addition to his great natural ability, he combined English good sense, and correct literary taste, with German thoroughness of erudition. He agrees with Payne Knight on the divided authorship of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but does not separate them in age by any serious interval. He advances beyond him by admitting what the Germans had unanimously accepted—the want of connection of parts in the *Iliad*. The arguments of W. Müller, G. Hermann, and Lachmann forced him to see the inconsistencies of the *Iliad* to be more than mere forgetfulnesses. But he does not admit the necessity of supposing more than two authors—one of an *Achilleis*, the other of an *Iliad*. He constructs an ingenious theory about the piecing together of these poems, and the possibility of resolving the *Iliad* into its component parts. As to the hypothesis of an aggregation of independent lays, mechanically combined in the time of Peisistratus, he refutes it by arguments so strong that I can hardly conceive them else than final. Whatever doubts may remain as to his positive theory on the construction of the *Iliad*, his general review of the German authorities up to the year 1854 is of inestimable value to the English reader.

¹ *Hist. of Greece*, part i. chap. xxi.

The theory of Grote, received with great respect and considerable adhesion in Germany, has not yet triumphed among us over the old-fashioned views advocated by Mr. Gladstone—not at least generally, for there are many English scholars who have of late shown tendencies towards a critical attitude.

§ 47. But after many years Grote's labours have borne their fruit in the learned work of Professor Geddes, of Aberdeen, who has taken up and expanded them into a peculiar and ingenious theory of his own.¹ Accepting the severance of the *Iliad* into an *Achilleis* and an *Iliad*, he spends much ingenuity in showing that the *Achilleis* is by a different and an earlier poet, whose psychology, mythology, and personal character are ruder and less artistic than those of the later poet, but who possesses certain massiveness and fierceness which are very striking. The tastes and the beliefs of this poet point, he thinks, to a Thessalian origin; and this accounts for such features as his love of the horse, an animal common only in a few parts of Greece, and his limited geographical knowledge, which is well-nigh confined to the northern Ægean. But as to the rest of our *Iliad*, Professor Geddes advances a long way beyond Grote, and, indeed, opposes him, holding that it was not only the work of one poet, but that this poet was also the author of the *Odyssey*, and the real Homer. This conclusion he seeks to establish by showing that the strong contrasts between the *Achilleis* and the rest of the *Iliad* are all contrasts carried out in the *Odyssey* as compared with the *Achilleis*. He is, in fact, a *chorizontist*, or separator, but draws his line through the middle of the earlier poem and not at its close. In mythology, in manners and customs, in the use of peculiar words and epithets, he draws out tables to show that the *Odyssey* and the *Odyssean cantos* of the *Iliad* agree, and are opposed to the *Achilleid*.

With his separatist arguments I am perfectly satisfied, and think he has brought valuable evidence in detail to show the critical sagacity of Grote in guessing the truth on general grounds; but his positive theory is vitiated by accepting what Grote and all the men of his day accepted—the unity of the

¹ *The Problem of the Homeric Poems* (1879).

Odyssey. Writing, though in 1878, without regard to Kirchhoff's work, he thinks that any likeness in the 'Ulyssean' cantos of the Iliad to any part of the Odyssey proves unity of authorship in these cantos. This evidence rather proves that the same school of poets was at work on both poems, and that the framers of the Odyssey were either contemporaneous with the completers of the Iliad, or copied closely the Ionic features which appear in the 'Ulyssean' cantos. I am still disposed to place the Odyssey as a whole later than the Iliad, and 'in the old age of Homer,' as the Greek tradition expresses it; but no doubt some books of the Iliad, such as K, Ψ, and Ω, may be as late as the lays of the Odyssey.¹

¹ This theory of Professor Geddes receives curious corroboration from a German source which he never quotes, and which may therefore be looked on as supporting him on perfectly independent grounds. Sengebusch, in his elaborate *Dissertationes Homericae* (prefixed to Dindorf's Teubner text of Homer) develops a most important Homeric theory, altogether in pursuance of the remaining fragments of Aristarchus' criticism, which is to him the infallible guide in these matters. Adopting from Aristarchus the Attic origin of the Homeric epic, he believes the tradition that Homer, or his parents, or at any rate his poetry, passed with the Ionic migration to Ios, then to Smyrna, and that there, in the new Ionic home, the Iliad and Odyssey saw the light. But he also holds that epic poetry in Athens was not indigenous, and came with Eumolpus, as the legend says, from Pierian Thrace or Thessaly, the original home of the Olympian worship of the Muses. These Thracian singers separated into Heliconian (Boeotian) and Attic, and from the latter arose the poet or the school which passed into Ionia. Moreover, Sengebusch rejects all arguments to prove that the Odyssey is younger than the Iliad, or by a different school of poets—here, too, following in the wake of Aristarchus. In all its main features this theory of Sengebusch, which is sustained with masterly ability, and with a knowledge of the Homeric scholia such as few possess, is upon the same lines as Professor Geddes' book, though Sengebusch divides his homage for Aristarchus with his homage for his master Lachmann so far as to admit against Aristarchus that a school of bards working together may have composed the poems, but within a very few years, as the *Nibelungenlied* is said to have been put together between 1190 and 1210 A.D. Thus Sengebusch would hold that the earlier epics composed in Thrace or Attica had disappeared, while Professor Geddes holds that they have distinctly survived in the Achilleid. If our English scholars would but acquaint themselves with the rest of European study on their subjects, some general agreement might not be impossible.

§ 48. The atomistic theory of both Iliad and Odyssey has, moreover, received unexpected support from the rise of comparative mythology into philological importance. For upon this theory the legends of the siege of Troy are mere echoes of immensely older solar myths; the names of the heroes are adapted from those of solar phenomena; and extreme easiness of belief on this point is compensated by a corresponding scepticism as to the age of their combination into larger unities. The most prominent advocate of this view is Mr. F. A. Paley, who not only accepts the destructive criticism of Wolf, Lachmann, and all the Germans, but even refuses to the commission of Peisistratus the fabrication of the poems, and believes that the Iliad and Odyssey did not receive their present form till the time of Plato.¹ He bases this judgment on the facts (1) that the quotations from Homer in earlier authors do not correspond with our text; (2) that the earlier art of the Greeks in sculpture, vase painting, and tragedy seems to have borrowed very little from our present text, though perpetually reproducing other Trojan legends; (3) that there are late forms of language in the poems, and blundering archaicisms; (4) that the common use of writing, required for the composition and dissemination of the poems, cannot be proved earlier than the days of Pericles. He advances to the position that possibly Antimachus of Colophon, or some obscurer contemporary, put our Iliad and Odyssey together from loose materials—in the words of Dio Cassius, ‘having got rid of Homer, he introduces to us instead Antimachus of Colophon, a poet whose very name we hardly knew.’ What we do hear of Antimachus is this: that he was a notably frigid and unsuccessful epic poet, contemporary with Plato; that his poems were extant, and are quoted in the Venetian scholia by the Alexandrian critics; that he prepared an edition of the Iliad, which is quoted constantly in the same scholia as one of those *κατ’ ἀνδρα*, and as inferior to and more recent than the city

¹ The following tracts contain Mr. Paley’s various restatements of his theory: *On Quintus Smyrnaeus* &c. (1876); *Homerus Periclis ætate*, &c. (1877); *Homeri quæ nunc extant*, &c. (1878); and his article in *Macmillan’s Magazine* for March, 1879.

editions, when it differs from them. These facts surely dispose of the claim of any such new Homer, if it were not already sufficiently absurd to imagine the noiseless and unnoticed birth of the two great epics in a literary and critical age.

It is moreover only by inventing an impossible epoch that Mr. Paley has found a date for the composition of the poems. He places it *after the Tragic poets and before Plato*, who knows and quotes our text. But Sophocles and Euripides were composing tragedies until Plato was of age, and the latest of these plays show no greater familiarity than those of Æschylus with our Homer. This silence then of the dramatists must have been intentional, and proves nothing for Mr. Paley.¹

Again, the absence of reference in Greek tragedy to the subjects of the Iliad and Odyssey cannot be explained by their non-existence as epics, for it would equally demonstrate the non-existence of the separate lays which compose them, and would thus prove infinitely too much, as not even Mr. Paley will assert that the *materials* of the epics were not old. If they existed as separate lays, their excellence would have secured their frequent imitation, but for the only tenable reason—the conscious abstaining of later Greek art from touching these great masterpieces. Thus the Odyssey carefully avoids all iteration of, or even allusion to, the Iliad.

The assertion of the late dissemination of writing in Greece has been disproved by the actual existence of old inscriptions.

I cannot here turn aside to discuss the linguistic arguments of Mr. Paley, but will only refer to Mr. Sayce's supplementary chapter in this volume, where it is shown, with a full appreciation of Mr. Paley's objections, that no really recent origin can be inferred from the grammatical complexion of our text. I will add, moreover, that the newer researches into Homeric language prove in many respects not its recent, but its exceedingly ancient complexion. This is, I believe, more strictly the case with Homeric syntax, so far as it has been examined.

§ 49. The history of criticism on the Odyssey, which has

¹ The reasons of Æschylus, the father of tragedy, for preferring other legends than Homer's are well explained by Nitzsch in the second volume of his *Sagenpoesie der Griechen*.

been necessarily touched in the foregoing sketch, is somewhat simpler than that of the Iliad. Wolf, who felt so strongly the piecemeal character of the Iliad, declares himself as struck at every fresh perusal with the harmony and unity of the Odyssey. Grote, who wonders that critics have commenced with the more complicated and difficult poem, asserts that the question of unity would never have been raised had the Odyssey alone been preserved. The most trenchant dissectors of the Iliad, and those who stoutly maintain it to be an aggregate without any presiding plan among the authors of its fragments, confess that the Odyssey differs in the much greater method and clearness of its structure, and at least represents the work of a far more experienced arranger. Nevertheless, the Germans could not but admit large interpolations. Even Nitzsch, Bäumlein, Schömann, Bergk, and other defenders of its unity, admit this, nor do any of them maintain the conclusion (from ψ 296 to the end) which Aristophanes had already rejected.

But the effect of pulling to pieces the Iliad at last began to tell on the Odyssey. The task of hunting for supposed discrepancies and the sutures of divers accounts is too congenial to the German analyst, and too well suited to his tone of thinking, to permit so large and complicated an epic as the Odyssey to escape his censure. So, beginning from Spohn's tract (1816), and Kayser's Program of 1835, a series of acute monographs have assailed the consistency of the Odyssey, and endeavoured to show that this poem also is made up of several special songs, at least four in number, with interpolations besides. By far the ablest of these critics and their acknowledged master is A. Kirchhoff,¹ whose views are now generally adopted and developed by the Atomistic school.

While this writer shares with his countrymen their oversubtlety, and not very convincing æsthetical judgment as to what is good and bad, or as to what is excusable or inexcusable, in an old poet reciting to an unlettered and uncritical audience, he nevertheless shows with real force many evidences of patching in the Odyssey which had hitherto escaped other scholars. He makes it very probable that the advice of

¹ *Die Composition der Odyssee* (Berlin, 2nd ed., 1879).

Athene to Telemachus in α is made up not very skilfully from the subsequent narrative. Still more clearly he shows how the action is too manifestly delayed by the absence of any direct reply of Odysseus to the point-blank question of Arete as to his name and family.¹ He also shows grounds for asserting that the long narrative (κ - μ) put into the first person in Odysseus' mouth was adopted from older narratives in the third person. He discovers two inconsistent reasons, one natural and the other miraculous (ν 429), for the non-recognition of Odysseus. He believes therefore that the old *nostos* of Odysseus was greatly enlarged, and endeavours to show, on various grounds, that this took place somewhere about Ol. 30. His theory seems very parallel to that of Grote on the *Iliad*, who holds the shorter, and I think older, *Wrath of Achilles* to have been expanded by the borrowing of whole books from a longer *Iliad*.

§ 50. The examination of particular passages throughout the *Odyssey* has not yet been carried out by the Germans with their accustomed detail,² but enough has been done to bring the latest advocates of its unity, Bergk and Faesi, to admit large interpolations. I do not think the theory of a mechanical aggregation by Peisistratus is now held by any man of sense in Germany; it being universally allowed that the plan is an essential part of the composition, and that it is considerably older than the famous commission. Mr. Paley alone ventures to class it in this respect along with the *Iliad*, and bring down its compilation to those well-known and critical days when every new poem was named and claimed by a jealous author.

The controversy concerning the composition of the *Odyssey* is growing hot in Germany, but the main point at issue is not quite the same as in the case of the *Iliad*. The theory of aggregation of short lays being very improbable, and that of a plan guiding the composition or adaptation of the lesser unities being generally accepted, it remains to account for the

¹ Cf. the interpolation α 270-97 with β 209, sq.; and η 238, to which no answer is vouchsafed until ι 19.

² Cf. now Fick's work on the *Odyssey* in its original *Æolic* form, a very curious and important work, of which more presently.

numerous passages, which are, in the opinion of German critics, out of harmony with this plan, and so inconsistent with it that they cannot have been composed by the poet who framed the general narrative. On the one hand, the school of Kirchhoff, represented by Friedländer, Bonitz, Hartel, and others, hold that these passages¹ are vamped together, or arranged by the poet who was uniting the adventures of Telemachus with the return of Odysseus, and who framed the main narrative of Odysseus' travels as a recital by the hero himself. They hold that original passages were deliberately left out, or changed into the form in which we now have them, and that the unskilfulness with which this has been done lets us see when and why it has been undertaken. Kirchhoff rejects altogether as unscientific the assumption of interpolations, unless a distinct reason can be assigned which prompted such interpolation.

This great principle, which ought to become a canon in criticism, is a terrible blow to the speculations of his opponents, who accordingly attack him vehemently. Of these Düntzer, Heimreich, Kammer, and Bergk maintain that they can restore the primitive form of the *Odyssey* by merely extending the proceeding of Aristarchus, and rejecting as interpolations such passages as are inconsistent in thought, or unworthy in style, when compared with the genuine poetry of the *Odyssey*. They allow large room for critical taste, and accordingly differ widely as to the merit or demerit of sundry suspected passages. To assert the unity of the *Odyssey* in any honest or real sense is now nearly as obsolete in Germany as it is to assert the unity of the *Iliad*. It is even very unusual to find competent critics, like Sengebusch, who will assert that the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* even in part come from one poet or from poets of the same age and school. Professor Geddes is led to this view by assuming the *Odyssey* to be one and indivisible, and finding close correspondences in certain parts of the *Iliad*; Sengebusch evidently by the authority of Aristarchus, who asserted

¹ Such as α 269-302, μ 370-390, ν 94 compared with ο 50 (the same day).

the author of the Iliad to have anticipated the Odyssey in many of his allusions.¹

§ 51. A calm review of this long controversy suggests several curious reflections, which have so large an application that they can hardly be here out of place. The first point which strikes us is the remarkable contrast of attitude between the English and German critics. The Germans, one and all, lay the greatest stress on matters of detail; and it is quite an admitted axiom among them that any passage inconsistent with the general argument, or illogical, or merely repeating a previous idea, *cannot be genuine*. Of course they quarrel violently over their facts, some declaring against passages which others assert to be necessary to the text and of the highest importance. Secondly, it is generally asserted among them, though not universally admitted, that passages of inferior merit come from the hand of interpolators, and are also to be rejected; but as the question of poetic merit is purely subjective, and as the Germans are not over-competent, though very positive as regards it, the admission of this principle necessarily destroys all chance of ultimate agreement. Thirdly, it seems tacitly assumed by them all, that all the interpolators or imitators, or later poets, if such there were, must be inferior to the older and more original bards. Without this assumption, the second principle is in absolute jeopardy; and yet why may it not constantly be false? Thus the poet of the last book of the Iliad, generally believed to be later than the rest, is surely a poet of the very first order, and in the opinion of any fair critic this book must be held superior to many of those which precede it. It is even highly conceivable that the very excellence of a later lay might be the cause of its reception in an older and poorer composition.

The English, on the other hand, are all impressed with the fact that no large plan can be carried out without a great deal of inaccuracy in the details, even in critical days; they cite modern poets and novelists who have been guilty of the grossest blunders of this kind; they maintain that such things are abso-

¹ All the works of the German authors mentioned will be found enumerated in the notes to Bonitz' last edition (1881) of his excellent pamphlet *On the Origin of the Homeric Poems*.

lutely to be predicted in long poems, composed without writing, for an uncritical audience, in an uncritical age. They regard all the dissection of details by the Germans as the result of irrelevant subtlety, provided a general harmony of plan, of diction, and of character can be established. They have taken great pains to show such harmony, especially in the characters, and have even applied psychological subtleties to explain away great inconsistencies, as in the cases of Agamemnon and Hector.

This contrast of attitude is so strong that it has blinded each nation to the importance of what has been said by the other, unless we admit the explanation that few scholars of either nation are able to appreciate accurately the force of an argument in a foreign tongue. They read, indeed, or rather quote each other; but it is certain that to apprehend the force of an intricate and tedious polemical statement, the reader must be able to run along quite easily in the language of the writer. It is the absence of this facility which produces both the general contempt and the occasional veneration shown by the two nations for each other's work. The natural results have followed. Each side spoils by exaggeration a very strong case. While the Germans exhibit not a little pedantry in many of their criticisms, and often rouse the astonishment of the reader by the dulness of their literary judgments, they have certainly detected too many flaws and contradictions to be overlooked and explained away. While the English are, on their side, too subtle in discovering harmonies, and over-generous in condoning blunders, they have certainly made a strong case for a general unity of plan in both poems, and their arguments on this point, if read with any care, might have made the Germans less confident in their assumptions. There is but one critic—Grote—who seems really at home in the writings of both sides; accordingly he has propounded an intermediate theory on the *Iliad*, which is, I conceive, not far from the truth. Had he continued to study the question after Kirchhoff's analysis of the *Odyssey* became known, he might have modified his views on this poem. The absence of all reference in his notes to the work of Kirchhoff makes it plain that he had not followed up the controversy beyond the date of his fourth edition.

§ 51*. Kirchhoff, in the preface to his book (*die homerische Odyssee*, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1879), sums up briefly the leading points of his theory, which is here more definitely stated than in his previous essays. He holds our *Odyssey* to be made up (1a) of the old *Nostos* of Odysseus,¹ composed at a very early date, complete in itself, and of the highest poetic merit, but composed when epic composition was already at its zenith, and far from its rude beginnings. (b) He has since discovered that a younger *Nostos*, in which Kirke and Helios play the same parts as Poseidon and Kalypso in the original *Nostos*, has been embodied in it. (2) An early continuation of this *Nostos* by a later poet, but still before the first Olympiad in date. This poet sang the adventures of Odysseus after his return,² embodying in the work many shorter lays which we cannot now sever. That this poet was not identical with the composer of the *Nostos*, Kirchhoff infers with perfect confidence³ from the fact that in poetical merit he is far beneath him. *Aus diesem für sich allein völlig durchschlagenden Grunde (!) ist es ganz unmöglich Identität der Verfasser anzunehmen.* (3) Then come (in an appendix) the *Adventures of Telemachus*, very loosely fitted to the *Nostos* and *Tisis*. (4) But anyone who looks into these separately printed divisions of Kirchhoff's text will notice long passages in a smaller type. These are due to the later redaction of the poem, about Ol. 30, by a person of no poetic power, who expanded the earlier work, and in his turn combined the whole with all manner of needless and disturbing interpolations.

The reader will easily see how far I am disposed to agree with this definite theory. I am unable to feel the decided inferiority of the second poet, and I see no evidence that he must have lived before 776 B.C. But in holding a conscious combination of larger unities by a poet-artist in the eighth century, Kirchhoff seems to me correct. How far the redactor of the thirtieth Olympiad is necessary cannot be determined without an intricate discussion. The usual German feature of settling antiquity, and denying identity, according to subjective

¹ a-v 184.

² v 182-ψ 296 (he calls it *τρίσις*).

³ p. 496.

notions of poetic merit, has not diminished in Kirchhoff's now long-matured views.

§ 52*. It is but just to the reader that I should here say something concerning the later literature of the Homeric controversy, and the attitude which the question has assumed since the publication of my last edition. At the risk of appearing to overrate my former decision, I am obliged to state that the general solution then offered has since become the prevalent one among critics, as may be easily seen by an examination of the newest books. Thus M. Maurice Croiset, in his very interesting volume, though he rather insists upon his differences from Grote's theory than his agreements, and though he classes me as a strict adherent of that theory, in reality only modifies it in the direction which I had indicated, and produces a more explicit and expanded account of the genesis of the poems, which is but a further step in the same direction.¹ But I will not underrate the additions he has made, and will sketch as briefly as I can this new and highly reasonable Homeric theory. While accepting the critical results which have established varieties and irregularities of style, as well as positive inconsistencies, in the poems, he is not satisfied with attributing these signs of various workmanship to the amalgamation of two complete or definite poems, an *Achilleis* and an *Iliad*. But while he insists, as I did, upon the scattered and individual character of the lays which Grote called an early *Iliad*, he is of course obliged to hold, as I did, that it was a great tragic idea, a great human interest—the wrath of one man and its consequences—which made one poet, whom we may call the original Homer, superior to all his rivals. Even he did not compose his lays to be sung in one connected whole. They were, M. Croiset supposes, mere separate lays, such as those sung by Demodocus in the eighth book of the *Odyssey*, but yet they were related to one another, inasmuch as they were stories grouped round one idea, in chronological sequence, and felt by the audience to be parts of the same legend. Thus this series of lays and their author began to gain and to retain a greater popularity than the rest, and when their author passed

¹ *Histoire de la Litt. grecque* (1890), vol. i. chap. 4, § 5.

away, his name and work were kept alive by a class of singers, probably at Chios, who not only preserved them, but presently began to enlarge them by composing other lays within the framework of the same story, more or less closely allied to the original Homer. The days of literary property, of claiming or protecting originality, were not yet. Every poet and every hearer would only desire to see so great an idea enlarged and perfected.

Accordingly, early bards, differing in ability but resembling in style and feeling, began to expand the Achilles-lays with new matter, partly by imitating the *Acts* of Achilles or of Agamemnon in composing praise of other heroes, partly by episodes such as the parting of Hector and Andromache, the Embassy to Achilles, and the long combats about the fleet, to which a rampart was added, and many other features not found in the original conception. These are the *supplementary lays* of M. Croiset, who wisely refuses to be bound down in details, but expounds the general process with great clearness. I will again insist upon one point which he mentions without dwelling upon it. The suitability for recitation at particular courts was attained by composing *aristeia* in which the ancestors of the several princes were ennobled by giving them a prominent place in the poem.

When many such supplementary lays had been composed, and had become popular, there arose the difficulty of fitting them chronologically into the original frame—a difficulty never completely overcome, and one which first led modern critics to suspect a composite origin. The device resorted to by the bards was the composing of the *accommodating lays* of M. Croiset, generally of later style and inferior workmanship, inasmuch as they seek by allusions and vampings to fill up the gaps and close the sutures in the expanded poem. To give an example: the lay of the Embassy (ix.) ends with a refusal of Achilles to interfere; it could not therefore come in after the Patrocleia, which moves Achilles in the opposite direction. Hence it must come before that long and varied conflict, including the Exploits of Agamemnon (xi.). On the other hand, it must not come immediately after the Quarrel (i.), in which Agamemnon is haughty and uncompromising in tone towards Achilles.

Hence it must be placed after the Exploits of Diomedes. But as these are all victories of the Greeks, it was necessary to compose a defeat (viii.) which would account for the humble Embassy. In this way, not by a Commission, not by a mere Arranger, but by the free treatment of a school of poets, an implicit unity of idea became explicit. The original genius had as it were marked out the new territory with three or four isolated but magnificent towers; others filled in his plan by richer and more decorated, but less massive buildings; lastly came the wall of rubble masonry, which closed the gaps and completed the noble city. Such is the theory in which M. Croiset gathers and systematises the converging results of modern criticism.

§ 53*. Mention must next be made of the elaborate critical edition of the *Iliad* published by W. Christ,¹ which not only contains a careful recension of the text according to the newest lights, but also an explicit Homeric theory, in the *Prolegomena* and *Epilegomena* to the text. The main results will be found enumerated at pp. 91-6 of the first volume. They are briefly as follows. The *Iliad* is not a conglomerate of lays originally distinct, and brought into an imperfect unity, but rather the expansion of an originally artistic and dramatic unity, made up of books A, Λ 1-595, II and P, Y 381- Φ 227, and Φ 526 to the end of X. This selection, according to Christ, shows a great logical as well as poetical superiority. The first addition was made either by the original poet himself, or his immediate school, and consisted of the books M-O, inserted between Λ and II. Then come the introduction by another poet of Sarpedon and the Lycians, of the mission to Achilles (I) and of the sequel to the death of Hector, i.e. his ransom and funeral. Later, but still in a good epoch, and from competent poets, come the Doloneia, the Shield of Achilles, the Games, and some more lays.

The Catalogue is the latest accretion, made *before the first Olympiad*, at the time when the *Odyssey* was being completed, and Arctinus, Lesches and Stasinus were already composing. Pisistratus and his Commission added hardly anything, but deserve great credit for bringing all the poems together in

¹ Leipzig, Teubner, 1884.

their proper order, and so publishing them that this order was secured for the future. But the poems had already been written down, and were known by their initial verses. Christ thinks that probably two, or at most four poets, not differing in age by one hundred years, composed the real Iliad. The additions were made by many hands. He proceeds (p. 95) to give a list of the several lays under six heads or periods.

I need not repeat what I have so often said as to the subjective taste of this sort of criticism, which adopts poems as genuine because they seem to the critic better than the rest, and assumes that no later poet can excel or even rival the older composers. Such canons, though almost universal among the Germans, seem hardly based on common sense, or upon a calm review of the development of poetry among men. Christ, indeed, himself, in his *Epilegomena* makes some changes in the arrangement, which in the text are indicated by the use of three various types for various strata of the poems.

But what does he say of the new theory of Fick, to which I am about to introduce the reader? He seems to me evidently a more than mature scholar, trained upon the received traditions of Homeric grammar, and unable to face the problem from a new point of view. He rejects an Æolic origin for the Homeric epic, because (1) the subject-matter points to an Ionic origin (p. 126), and cites in a brief sentence Nestor, Athene, the Cayster, Poseidon, Glaucus, as all Ionic gods, heroes, or rivers appearing in the oldest or most remarkable parts of the Iliad. This last alternative, however, invalidates his argument, if we do not assume that the most remarkable must be among the oldest poets.

But what about (2) the Æolic forms? While ready to admit them (cf. his § 74, sq.), he will not admit that they constitute an argument for a different type of Iliad, and falls back upon what I consider the exploded view that a mixture of dialects may have been deliberately used in the first composition of the poems. He gives three different explanations of the phenomenon in various parts of his treatise: (a) that Homer may have borrowed these forms, especially in names and formulæ, from older Æolic poets; (β) that the dialect of Smyrna, and

even of Chios, inhabited by both races, may have contained an actual mixture in the speech of the people ; (γ) that these Æolic forms are the remains of the oldest form of Greek, kept alive in the epic language.

The first account almost gives up the point in dispute, for if the so-called Homer borrowed from Æolic poets, can we believe that he selected isolated forms, and that he did not rather transcribe or adapt actual lays? The second assumes that a spoken jargon, and not a really literary dialect, was the language of Homer—a supposition contrary to all that we know of Greek poetry. The third is based upon an ignorance of the laws which rule the development of dialects, as it assumes that determined Æolic forms, and not the vaguer mother forms from which both Æolic and Ionic can be derived, were the primitive Greek speech ; and what Fick says in reply is unanswerable, viz., that our oldest Ionic remains, reaching to 700 B.C., have no traces of this sort of impossible primitive dialect.

But another and far more important theory regarding, not only the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but all the early poetry of the Greeks, is that developed by August Fick in a series of very remarkable articles in *Bezzenberger's Beiträge* reaching over the last seven years, in the course of which he has also published the 'purified' text of the *Odyssey*, and of part of the *Iliad*, the 'purified' text of Hesiod (1883 and 1887 respectively), and has given us texts of most of the early lyric and elegiac poetry. This theory, starting from purely linguistic grounds, has advanced to constructive arguments from æsthetic reasons, and he has recently (especially in his *Hesiod*) adopted, in concert with arguments from dialect, another test of genuineness, which is based on a law of arithmetical symmetry. It seems to me most astonishing that this large theory, resulting in a comprehensive handling of all the old texts, has as yet received no consideration in English classical publications. In the last edition of this book I could only announce it, as it had not assumed its mature form in the distinguished author's mind, and indeed he has recalled a good many statements made in the only expression of his theory then accessible. But since that time we have only an occasional timid allusion, or a con-

temptuous rejection in a sentence, like those of Christ and Croiset, which show that our Homeric scholars are either afraid of the theory or have not taken the trouble to study it.

Mr. Sayce's appendix (in the first edition of this book) gave a summary of the facts upon which Prof. Fick has enlarged considerably, and upon which his theory is based—I mean, the analysis of the dialectical forms to be found in our *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The main fact there established is the composite and artificial character of Homeric language. The ancient critics had long since observed that there were Æolic, Ionic and Attic forms side by side in the poems, and naïvely conjectured that the great poet had, with a full knowledge of all these dialects, of his wisdom selected from each what suited his purpose, or fitted his metre. Such a notion of poetic taste or of primitive genius in literature would seem too grotesque to be worth stating, were not a very usual modern notion of equal absurdity still current—that this jumble of forms represents the old Ionic speech of the people among whom the earliest poets composed and recited.

The notion that any primitive dialect contains the developed differences found in its widely varying descendents, in use, and side by side, is an hypothesis not less absurd than that just mentioned.¹ It is refuted, if it require refutation, by the fact noticed in Fick's recent studies of the old Ionic poets Archilochus, Semonides, &c., that in them, at a date not far removed from Homer, or from most of what we call Homer, no trace of such a jumble of forms is to be found. Why it *is* found in the more recent elegists is one of the most ingenious points of his theory. The fact remains, then, that two distinct dialects, the Æolic, such as is shown in its later stage by Alcæus and Sappho, and the Ionic, such as we know it in the elegists, and afterwards in Herodotus (its later stage), are embedded in the present text. I shall say nothing at present of the distinctly Attic forms which are akin to New-Ionic, or of the few curiosities which seem constructed upon false analogies, and of which Mr. Sayce has given specimens in the Appendix. I am not sure

¹ The κῶς of Herodotus cannot be derived from the πῶς of Homer, but both from a parent form κῑῶς which explains them (*B.B.*, Fick's *Odyssey*, p. 5).

that blunders in language (in the strictly theoretical sense) are always the mistakes of imitative poetasters ; they may be the mistakes of an unlearned age, applying analogy falsely to cases which are only parallel in sound, and not in reality. The point of moment is the juxtaposition of Æolic and Ionic, two forms of Greek as mutually exclusive as Genoese and Venetian in Italian, as Somerset and Cork English in our own islands.

No rational explanation was ever given of this phenomenon till August Fick saw that the poems had been originally composed in one of them, and then transliterated into the other. Such a proceeding, far from being exceptional, or as some objected, unique, is almost universal, when a later age seeks to make ancient poems intelligible to a society whose language has changed, and which finds obsolete forms strange and disagreeable. Thus in our own literary history Dryden reformed Chaucer, and Bishop Percy (in a less degree) the ballads of older days. Low German poems have (I believe) been transliterated into High German, or *vice versa*, and in all these cases where the metre was built upon an antique form, this form was retained, while the neighbouring forms were altered. In the well-known epigram on the heroes of Thermopylæ (ascribed to Simonides) a Doric form *τέτορες* has been left in the distich otherwise transformed into good Ionic, because *τέσσάρες* would not scan.

The transliteration, therefore, if supported by good arguments, is neither unique nor surprising. But it must be shown that one of the dialects is older and essential, the other newer and superficial. This is the task which Fick has undertaken (*B.B.* vii. 139, sq., and introduction to his *Odyssey*), as I think, with complete success. He shows that no possible ordinary speech of any Greek race would use the forms in long *α* and in *η* simultaneously as they are found in Homer. ΝΥΜΦΗ, ΑΤΡΕΙΔΗΣ stand beside ΘΕΑ, ΝΑΥΣΙΚΑΑ, and, still more oddly, beside their own genitives ΝΥΜΦΑΩΝ, ΑΤΡΕΙΔΑΩ. Legends placed the birth of Homer at Smyrna, which once had been Æolic, but passed into Ionic hands, and from thence onward we know that the school of early rhapsodists settled at Chios, which was Ionic. There are, then, plenty of suggestions on either side. The legends are Æolic ; the

seat of the Trojan war is Æolic; the subsequent preservation and spread of the poems was entirely due to Ionic hands. The antecedent probabilities are therefore in favour of an Æolic original, transformed by Ionic reciters. But yet they did not do it thoroughly. They left unmistakable traces of the digamma, which had vanished early from Ionic Greek, at all events in our earliest certain specimens, such as Callinus. But I will refer the reader to the appendix for the details concerning Æolic forms. They were first separated and collected by G. Hinrichs.

Upon close examination Fick found that these Æolic forms only remained where the corresponding Ionic forms would not suit the metre, or where there was no equivalent form in Ionic; and this he follows out in great detail.¹ He shows that in considerable portions of the poems the Ionic forms can be replaced by what we know to have been their Æolic equivalents, while the reverse process is impossible. But this is not everywhere the case. In some portions of the poems the Ionic dialect is essential, and cannot be Æolised. It is a striking coincidence that the lays in which this latter condition of things is found are the very lays which independent critics have asserted to be the later parts, or additions, to the poems. This corroboration is so convenient, and is based upon such speculative work—especially that of A. Kirchhoff—that it may have done more to discredit than to confirm Fick's theory among cautious scholars. But even rejecting Kirchhoff's dissection of the *Odyssey*, the main facts of Fick's position remain unshaken. We need only admit that there are older and newer strata in the poems, and that the later portions were composed first in the independent Ionic dialect, afterwards in the crystallised Epic speech, which had become the model for later poets, and which was an artificial mixture which they mistook for primitive Greek. By this theory alone do the complicated phenomena of Homeric grammar receive their logical explication.

In his recent studies upon Hesiod (1887) the acute discoverer has burdened his theory with another development which I cannot but think unfortunate, as it rests upon the correctness of a series of hypotheses. He thinks that Hesiod, the

¹ *Odyssey*, pp. 12, sq.

Homeric Hymns, and the older portions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were composed on a system of symmetrical paragraphs, multiples of 9, or of 10 lines. Whole poems were divided into triads, these triads again into lesser members, till we come down to the unit, say of 9 or 10 lines. But in the first place he is obliged to assume various units in various poems. Secondly, no old poem or hymn gives him his required numbers without getting rid of a number of lines, or supposing the addition of lost verses. Lines superfluous to his scheme are rejected for all manner of reasons, in fact for any reason that comes to hand—because some editor has suspected them, or because they contain Ionic forms, or because they seem to Fick poor stuff, or because *they can be spared!* With these resources at hand, it seems to me that Fick produces his results somewhat after the fashion of the theologians of my youth dealing with the number 7 or the fatal 666 in the book of Revelations. And yet it may be that my impatience may yet be compared to that of other critics towards his dialect theory, which I regard as the most important step of our times in Homeric criticism. I must not extend this discussion any further, but will close with giving his own summary of results from the conclusion of his *Hesiod* (1887) and his most recent article (*B.B.* xvi. 1, sq. 1890.)

‘There were probably songs concerning gods and heroes at every epoch and everywhere among the oldest Greeks; the artistic or studied composition of the epos began with one branch, the Pierians about Mount Olympus, just as at the old Norse courts almost every Skald was an Iclander. These Pierians established the artistic metre, the language, and also the complicated numerical symmetries of epic poetry. For there are forms still to be found in Homer which are strange to Æolic, but appear in the dialect of northern Thessaly. Of these EMMEN and ΦΕΡΕΜΕΝ are examples. But of this Thessalian epic poetry we have no remains [unless it be in the glorifying of the special heroes of that country], and the epos makes a fresh start in Æolis. The earliest works of this school are the *Menis* (Wrath of Achilles), about 730 B.C., the original *Nostos* of Odysseus (about 710 B.C.). Possibly here

also arose the oldest form of the Thebais and the Argonautica, certainly (about 660) the little Iliad of Lesches, who came from Lesbos. The *Menis* and *Nostos* were circulated at an early period among the Achæans who had settled in Gnosus and Gortyn (in Crete). Here was formed a Cretan school, which added the books N Ξ O to the Iliad, the *Tisis* (Revenge of Ulysses) and the *Telemacheia* to the Odyssey. The *Tisis* is younger than the acts of Idomeneus in N (for the hero is familiar to the poet), but older than Archilochus, whose frag. 70 is modelled upon Σ 135; the poet of the *Telemacheia*, who makes allusions to Arctinus (660 B.C.) may be the so-called Homer, with whom Thaletas of Gortyn was said to be familiar.' What follows belongs properly to a subsequent chapter, but I shall give it here in its connection, and refer the reader back to it when we approach these later poets. 'A singer from Myrinna, subject to the royal house of the Pelopids of Kyme (whose last representative, Hermodike, daughter of Agamemnon, married Midas king of Phrygia, who was overcome by the Kimmerians in 680), carried the epos to Cyprus, and composed the *Oitos* (or Sorrows of Ilion). From this school came also the *Cypria*, and the Homeric hymns to Aphrodite. In Cyprus also, later than the *Cypria*, about 600 B.C., was completed the expansion of the Trojan epic, by which the *Menis* and *Oitos* [Grote's *Achilleis* and *Iliad*] were welded together and extended by the Cretan books N Ξ O.

'Hesiod of Kyme came about 690 B.C. to Hellas, and there founded, perhaps in contact with a surviving Thracian (Pierian) school at Delphi and Helicon, the Locro-Bœotian school.

'When Smyrna passed, about 700 B.C., from the Æolians to the Ionians, these latter began to study the epos. The younger *Nostos*, or expanded adventures of Odysseus, seems to have been composed at Teos. The Dorians of Rhodes were responsible for the Tlepolemus episode in E. After the conquest of the coast by the Persians in 540 B.C., Ionic rhapsodes transformed the epos into their dialect; the Iliad and Odyssey owe to Kynæthus of Chios, the Hesiodic poems to Kerkops of Miletus, their present form. But our oldest text-traditions do not reach back so far; they are derived from the Attic recen-

sion, made about 490 B.C. The second *Nekyia* (Od. ω 1-200) is younger than Kynæthus, who made his redaction for Syracuse in the year 504 B.C., and the writing of the first text was not in Ionic but Attic characters, where the non-distinction of O and E from Ω and H led to many subsequent mistakes.'

The reader will be justly astounded at the precision of many of these statements, nor is it possible for me to give him all the acute and learned arguments by which the author seeks to establish them. I will not here make myself responsible for more than one of his conclusions, and that the greatest of them—I mean, the transliteration of the older Æolic lays into an Ionic dress, which lets the older forms show through here and there, as evidence beyond dispute.

In reconsidering the whole question quite recently (*B.B.* xvi. 1890), Fick very properly rests the strength of his case, not on one argument, but on three. From the combination of these he infers the certainty of his conclusions. The first is that 'higher criticism' which starts from the principle that we must demand from original genius logical and æsthetical perfection, and that violations of plot and inconsistencies of detail prove spuriousness. But even Fick admits that this method of criticism may lead us astray; it is not necessary that mere repetitions should be later stuff, or that the original poets should be infallible and incapable of a slip. Nor can such general views determine with any accuracy where the old ends and the new begins. The linguistic test, however, comes to our aid. Where the Ionic dialect is not 'protected by the metre,' and allows us to rewrite it into Æolic; where the poetry is likewise excellent, we may declare that the old Æolic epos is before us. We may also bring to our aid the strophic principle which applies fixed numbers to the old lays. But of this I have already spoken.

I will only add his curious proof that 540 B.C. was the date of the transformation of the old epics. In his critical edition of the older Ionic personal poetry, he has shown that before 540 the Ionic poets make no use of the epos; after that date they constantly echo or refer to it. This curious phenomenon points to the fact that while the epos was Æolic, it was unfamiliar and unsuitable to the Ionians. No sooner had it

become Ionic, than its language becomes a sort of poetic model, and begins to influence all later literature.¹ Fick argues in great detail that the pretended Æolisms which still appear in the text of the earlier iambists and elegists are mere blunders for old Ionic forms which can be easily restored. On the other hand, in Archilochus and Semonides the digamma has already vanished from the speech of the people, so that its occurrence in our Homer cannot reasonably be referred to primitive Ionic use.

So far, and so far only, can I lay before the reader this remarkable theory, of which the real moment lies in the linguistic details of which Fick is confessedly one of the greatest living masters. But these belong to the difficult and complicated grammar of dialects, not to literary history. I need hardly repeat that the general outcome of all these studies, as regards the composition and the probable date of the Homeric poems, agrees generally with the views which I reasoned out and laid before the reader in the first edition of this book.

There are, of course, great difficulties still in the way; Christ's admirable discussion on the digamma² in his edition is a proof of it. The name Ἰλῖος, which generally has the digamma, is used eleven times where that letter would spoil the metre (p. 162), and though these instances come from later books, yet we should imagine the poets would here, if anywhere, have adhered to tradition.

It will require a generation or two to persuade the learned that the dialect of the poems is as composite as the plan. When doubts were first suggested concerning the latter, there was almost a howl of indignation. Could all the world have been wrong, could the critics from Aristotle to Mr. Gladstone err, who asserted the harmony and consistency of the details with the general plot? Yet as surely as this prejudice has given way under the light of reason, so the old superstitions concerning the language of Homer will vanish, and we shall learn to regard it as one which, in its present form, was never spoken, and in which no early or original Greek poet could ever have composed his lays.

¹ Cf. *B.B.* xi. 242, sq.

² *Op. cit.* §§ 91, sq.

CHAPTER V.

GENERAL REMARKS UPON THE ORIGIN AND THE
CHARACTER OF THE HOMERIC POEMS.

§ 52. It will not be here necessary to give a formal analysis of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, inasmuch as the texts are in every scholar's hands, and even those who are not familiar with Greek can study them in many excellent English translations. For our purpose it will be sufficient to sum up the general results attained by the long controversy on their origin, and offer some suggestions as to the points decided, and the points still in doubt. It is hardly requisite to add a word on the literary aspects of the poems, or to undertake to assist the student in his survey and his appreciation of them.

Looking in a broad way at the arguments for and against the unity of each poem, as bearing upon the unity or diversity of authorship, we may say that there is no controversy in which each side has been more successful in proving its case, and yet has more signally failed to overthrow its opponents. This is the impression which the controversy will make upon most unbiassed readers. As long as we study the advocates of the single author, so many undesigned coincidences, so many hidden harmonies, such consistency in the drawing of character, such uniformity in diction—in fact, such a cloud of witnesses is adduced, that the poem seems certainly the plan of a single mind. On the other hand, when we turn to the subtler analyses of destructive critics, they show us such a crowd of inconsistencies, such wavering in the drawing of character, such forgetfulness of any general plan, such evident traces of suture and agglomeration, that the

poem falls in sunder, and discloses a series of ill-matched fragments. But, as the advocates of unity are unable to smooth over these breaks and haltings, so the advocates of plurality are unable to destroy the strong impression produced in favour of a fairly consistent and harmonious plan. In fact, I am distinctly of opinion, that the moderate and critical advocates of the general unity even of the *Iliad*, as conceived and carried out by a single genius, hold the strongest and the most durable position. But hitherto, and especially in England, they have ruined their case by wild exaggerations, and by putting a greater strain upon our faith than it will bear.

§ 53. Thus, for example, they not only insist upon the unity of authorship of each poem separately, but that both are the work of the same man. This is one of the points which modern criticism has, in my opinion, finally decided in the negative. In the absence of any good evidence for the common authorship of the poems, the differences are quite sufficient to prevent us from assuming so improbable a hypothesis. The tone of the *Iliad* and that of the *Odyssey* are, to my mind, contrasted. The poet of the *Odyssey* is more quiet and reflective; he writes as a poet by profession, and alludes to others of his class as attached to various courts. He lives and moves not in Asia Minor, and close to the Mount Olympus of Bithynia, but in western Greece, and with his interests turning towards the fabled wealth of the western Mediterranean.¹ To him Mount Olympus is not a snow-clad visible peak, but a blessed habitation of the gods, where frost and storm are unknown. The lions that are so perpetually stalking through the coverts and prowling about the folds in the *Iliad*, are only described five

¹ On the other hand, Bergk (*LG.* i. p. 741) acutely points out that the troubles of the city of Erythræ, which are repeated from the history of Hippias by Athenæus (vi. 259), have so marked an analogy to the proceedings of the suitors in Ithaca—even the name of Irus recurring—that he believes the poet of the *Odyssey* to have lived in the neighbouring and closely connected Chios, and to have painted his scenes from contemporary history. But a temporary sojourn would have been sufficient to suggest the subject, and hence Bergk's argument can only prove that the poet knew Erythræ, not that he lived at Chios.

separate times in the *Odyssey*, and once at least with a complete ignorance of their habits.¹ Above all, there is a careful avoidance of all direct allusion to the *Iliad*, which seems nevertheless distinctly presupposed by the poet. This is hardly explicable if both proceeded from the same hand, but is easily reconcilable with the attitude of a conscious rival and follower. But all these details are as nothing when compared with the difference of tone, which is perfectly convincing to those who feel it.

The arguments adduced against these reasons are, in my opinion, either of no intrinsic weight, or based upon a grave misstatement of evidence. First comes the *à priori* assertion, that the coexistence or close succession of two poets of such genius is inconceivable. But we may reply, that the composition of the *Odyssey* is perhaps a century or more subsequent to that of the *Iliad*, and, in any case, whatever the law of the appearance of poetic genius may be, history shows that the coexistence of the greatest poets is rather the rule than the exception.

§ 54. Next comes the confident assertion, that the consistent tradition of the Greeks assigned the two poems to the same author. This is a serious misstatement, and the more likely to mislead because it is not absolutely false. The real state of the facts is as follows. When we examine the traditions of the earliest historical age in Greece, we find ascribed to Homer, not the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alone, but a vast body of epic literature, including a collection of *Hymns*, and several comic poems, in some of which there are even passages in iambic metre alternating with hexameters. Above all, let it be remembered that some of the cyclic epics, then commonly attributed to Homer, were composed by known poets, and within historical times. The name of Homer was, therefore, used in the same general way as we usually speak of the *Psalms of David*, though many of them not only make no claim to be composed by David, but are even distinctly assigned to other authors. In Greek literature the names of Hesiod and of Hippocrates were

¹ Cf. δ 791, ζ 130, ι 292, χ 402, with δ 335, repeated in ρ 126, where a doe is represented as leaving her young in a lion's lair—a perfect absurdity. Lions are simply mentioned a few times in addition (κ 212-8, δ 456, λ 610).

used in the same manner to denote a whole school of a peculiar kind.

This simple and uncritical attitude reaches down to the days of Pindar, who seems to ascribe all the cyclic epics to Homer, and recognises no other early poet except Hesiod. The critical labours of the commission of Peisistratus, and of such men as Theagenes of Rhegium, began to open men's eyes to the impossibility of holding this view. Herodotus questions the Homeric authorship of the *Cypria* and the *Epigoni*. Plato only once cites the *Cypria*, and as the work of an unknown poet. He appears from his other numerous quotations to have recognised only the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as genuine ; whereas Thucydides had still acknowledged the *Hymns* as such, and still later Aristotle quotes the *Margites* as a poem of Homer.

It appears, then, that of all our authorities on this question, down to the Alexandrian epoch, there is only one (Plato) who seems to hold that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and these alone, were the work of a single Homer. Nor is even this to be asserted positively, but merely as an inference from his silence on the *pseudo-Homerica*, or where he notes the existence of such apocryphal poems. We rather find successive critics disallowing work after work which had been attributed to the author of the *Iliad*, and we find that the two poems which resisted this disintegrating process longest were the *Odyssey* and *Margites*. It is even quite possible that the earliest attacks on the *Odyssey* may have preceded Aristotle's time.

But it must be kept in mind that those who may have allowed the Homeric authorship of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, after rejecting the rest, were opposing a feeling the very reverse of that which they are now quoted as opposing. They protested against too many works being ascribed to the poet ; they are now quoted as if they had protested against too few being ascribed to him. This is a totally different question, and one which they did not examine. The so-called consistent evidence of all old tradition as to this unity of authorship is really only the evidence of those who believed that every epic came from Homer ; then of those who believed that a great many epics and other poems came from Homer ; finally, of those who

were so occupied in rejecting other weaker claims upon his name, that they had not yet thought of discussing the claims of the *Odyssey*.

§ 55. That day, however, did come at last, and there was a school whose members carried their scepticism to this point. What its fate would have been is hard to say, had not the great Aristarchus crushed it by his authority. He was determined to put down the advance of this scepticism, which would doubtless have next assailed portions of the *Iliad*; and he succeeded. But the importance of the controversy is proved by his having written a special treatise against the *Chorizontes*, in which he sought to prove the common authorship of the two poems. It is very creditable to his sagacity that he endeavoured to prove it by the only argument which could become conclusive—by showing anticipations of the *Odyssey* implied in the *Iliad*. All other harmonies can be explained as the result of conscious agreement on the part of the later poet. A large body of undesigned anticipations in the older poem might indeed convince us. But Aristarchus' book is lost, and his modern followers have not attempted to sustain his position with reasonable evidence. Until, therefore, some new evidence is produced, which is well-nigh impossible, there seems no reason whatever for assuming the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to be the product of a single mind.

§ 56. Having thus disposed of the arguments in favour of this larger unity, we must approach the exaggerated attempts to show that each of the poems as a whole, with the exception of a stray line here and there, and perhaps the end of the *Odyssey*, is the work of a single poet developing a logical plot. Here the advocates of unity have really the verdict of antiquity to some extent with them, for although the *Doloneia* (κ) in the *Iliad* and the last book were much suspected, the sceptics of those days did not venture on the hypothesis of the absorption of lesser poems in the texture of the whole, and Aristarchus believed that all the difficulties could be removed by obelising inconsistent lines or sentences.

But here, again, I protest *in limine* against the evidence of the Greek public, or of any other public, being called in to settle a question of which no public can be a competent judge. What

higher authority upon poetry, say our opponents, can you have than the consent of ages? What more infallible verdict than that of successive nations and centuries? All these have felt the Iliad and Odyssey to be unities, and shall not this evidence outweigh the doubts of critics and the subtleties of grammarians? All this plausible talk is founded upon a capital *ignoratio elenchi*. It is perfectly true that the public is the ultimate and best judge of literature in one sense—that of its excellence—and that there is no instance of a bad work surviving for ages in public esteem. But surely it is absurd to set up the public as a judge of the unity of a plot, or the exact composition of an intricate system. On the contrary, uncritical readers are quite certain to imagine unity and consistency in any work handed down to them as one, however incongruous or contradictory its details. Thus the Psalms of David strike the average reader as the effusions of a single bard, in spite of headings asserting the contrary. Thus too the Book of Common Prayer would pass for the work of a single school, if not of a single pen, though there are plain traces of compromise between parties all through it. And so with a thousand other instances. The public, then, is no judge whatever of the unity of a poem, though an excellent judge of poetic merit.

§ 57. Let us now examine the alleged unity of the Iliad more in detail. The arguments advanced by such men as Colonel Mure and Mr. Gladstone, both expert controversialists, are of this kind—general uniformity of diction, general and even minute consistency in the characters, general sameness of style. They urge that when the poem is handed down by tradition as a single whole, these additional marks of design and unity are conclusive against attributing it to various poets. What they say, even though greatly exaggerated, has much weight against the advocates of an aggregation of shorter poems by a subsequent arranger, but has no force against the advocates of an original Iliad of moderate dimensions dilated by successive additions or interpolations. For in this case the enlargers or interpolators would take what care they could to observe harmonies of character and diction, and would do so sufficiently to satisfy the vulgar, though unable to deceive accurate criticism.

This is in fact exactly the case. The unity which strikes everyone at first, reading gradually breaks up when we are brought to reflect upon the logical coherence of the parts.

I am very far indeed from asserting the critical principle assumed as obvious by many Germans, that wherever there is plain violation of logical consistency, we have not the work of a single poet telling his own story. The history of modern literature, even in a critical age, shows ample instances of direct contradictions in the undoubted works of the greatest authors. But all these cases, so far as I know, arise from forgetfulness of details, and cannot be adduced to excuse such large improbabilities as we encounter through the *Iliad*. Yet, even in detail, I know not whether any parallel could be found (among great writers) to the narrative from H 313 to Θ 252, during which at least two days and nights elapse, and a series of inconsistent events—among others the building of a great fortification with gates—are crowded together, while the dead are being buried. Both Hermann and Lachmann¹ have brought out the details. Thus the fact that the same heroes are killed two or three times over may pass as unimportant, but how shall we defend the utter confusion of motives in the second book, the *first* view of the Greek chiefs by Priam from the wall in the tenth year of the war, the fear of Diomedes to meet some god in the form of Glaucus, when on the same day and in the same battle he has by divine instigation attacked and wounded both Ares and Aphrodite? How shall we defend the complete forgetfulness through all the rest of the poem of two great scenes—the single combat of Hector and Ajax, and the capture of the horses of Rhesus by Diomedes? In the perpetual encounters between Hector and Ajax all through the battle at the ships, Ajax never once alludes to his success in the single combat, though it was the common habit of Homer's heroes to boast of such things. In the races of the twenty-third book, Diomedes contends with the horses he took from Æneas in the fifth book, and no mention is made of the much finer horses which he carried off in the tenth. Some allusion to them here was not only natural, but necessary, if a single poet had been thinking

¹ *Betrachtungen zur Ilias*, p. 24.

out his story. More generally, the promise of Zeus that by the retirement and wrath of Achilles defeat and ruin shall come upon the Greeks, is followed in the *Iliad* by a series of brilliant victories on the part of the Greeks ; and we are well-nigh tired of the slaughter of the Trojans, before the least ray of success dawns upon them. This is not the work of a single poet carrying out a definite plan, but the work of other hands enlarging, and even contradicting, the original intentions of the author.

§ 58. But what was this plan, and what the work of the original author? I will endeavour briefly to sketch what seems to me the most probable theory, though it is obvious that no constructive criticism can be so safe or convincing as the mere exposure of flaws and defects.

It has already been shown that allusion is made by the authors to many earlier lays as in existence, and even as presupposed by the *Iliad*. There are endless details about the earlier history of the heroes, about their genealogies, and about the adventures of the gods, which are referred to as well known and current. It is almost certain that there were some lays on the actual subjects of the *Iliad* which were adopted or worked in by the poet. Every early poet makes free use of earlier materials, nor is there in the history of primitive literature any instance where the first great advance was not based on previous work. The attempt to discover and to sever out these primitive elements of the *Iliad* has been prosecuted by the Germans long and laboriously enough to show its utter futility. No two of the dissenters can agree, and if they did, they would fail to convince any candid critic that their results were more than guesswork. But they have undoubtedly shown many sutures and joining lines, so that, while failing in detail, they may fairly be said to have established their principle.¹

But all these debts of Homer to earlier lays are held to be debts of detail, and it is asserted, with good reason, that the new feature in the *Iliad*, and a principal cause of its success, was its splendid plan. Instead of singing the mere prowess of special heroes, or chronicling the events of a war, the great poet who struck out the *Iliad* devised a tragic plot,

¹ Cf. the newest summary of these analyses in Croiset, *L. G.* i. chap. 2.

into which he could weave character and incident, thus actually anticipating, as Aristotle clearly saw, the glories of Æschylus and his successors. The wrath of Achilles equalises the forces on either side, so that the characters and prowess of the lesser heroes appear; the friendship of Patroclus, his death and the fury of Achilles, the death of Hector—all these events are brought out under one idea—the wrath of Achilles.

§ 59. While agreeing with this view, I must insist upon two reservations: first, the plot was not absolutely original; secondly, it was unusually capable of extension.¹

It has not been remarked by any of the critics, that among the earlier lays mentioned in the *Iliad*, there is one which is of a far larger and more epic character than the rest—I mean that briefly told by Phœnix in the ninth book concerning the Life and Death of Meleager. There are here the materials for a splendid epic—the anger of Artemis, the ravages of the wild boar, his pursuit and death, the quarrel about his spoils, the consequent war of Curetes and Ætolians, the mother's curse on Meleager, his sullen refusal to help his country, the supplications of all his kindred, the storming of his city, his wife's prayers, his sudden reappearance and victory, his untimely death—all this (except the end) is told by Phœnix with a direct application to the wrath and sullen inaction of Achilles. Though this part of the ninth book probably did not belong to the original poem, it seems so early an addition, that its evidence as to the diffusion of the Legend of Meleager is to be trusted, and that the wrath and refusal of Meleager to help his country may have been the spark which kindled in the mind of Homer the plot of the *Achilleis*. There are ample differences and ample originalities in the *Iliad* to remove all pretence for asserting any plagiarism. I merely mean to say that if the short epic about Meleager was, as it seems to be, older than the *Iliad*, its leading idea is reproduced in the later poem.

§ 60. We come to the second and more important feature above mentioned, the elastic nature of the plot. When the wrath

¹ Niese (op. cit.), while contradicting the former strenuously, insists upon the second as a main point in his theory—viz. that all the added passages were composed for their place, and for the purpose of expansion.

of Achilles withdrew him from the field, and the Greeks began the struggle without him, it was quite natural that other heroes should endeavour to supply his place, and to avert the defeat which ultimately showed him to be necessary to his countrymen. But though the original poet may have designed and carried out some such extension, especially where Patroclus comes out to fight, still the present extensions of the plot are so distinctly at variance with the main idea, that we must at once admit the interpolation of considerable portions of the present text. Thus the long section which embraces books B-H is plainly foisted in by successive bards, when they sang the epic among Greeks who felt a national jealousy for the prowess of their ancestors, and who would not tolerate their defeat without inflicting greater loss upon the Trojans. This is really carried to an absurd length. The Greeks without Achilles are far more than a match for the Trojans. For every Greek that is slain at least two Trojans fall, and so we are brought to feel that these books were composed by poets actually contradicting the idea of the great tragic master who framed the plot.

It is likewise remarkable that these portions of the *Iliad* refer to events which are misplaced in the tenth year of the war, but highly suitable at its commencement. Such are the Catalogue, the viewing of the Greek heroes by Priam and Helen, the single combats of Paris and of Hector with Menelaus and Ajax. All these matters, as Grote clearly saw, belong to an *Iliad*, but not to an *Achilleis*. When Mure and Sittl (p. 73) say, in support of the unity, that it is inconceivable how all the greatest poets of separate lays should have confined themselves to the events of a few days in the tenth year of the war, they simply assume an absurdity. The events just mentioned, and the *aristeia* of the heroes, will suit any period in the war, and only needed a little adjustment to make them fit their place as indifferently as they now do.

The second,¹ third, and seventh books were perhaps adapted from an earlier *Iliad* for mere expansion's sake, or

¹ The *Catalogues* in this book are inconsistent in many details with the subsequent books: Meges and Medon are misplaced; Ajax (Salamis) strangely underrated; Mnestheus (Athens) overrated; Arcadians and Asiatic islanders introduced who do not figure in the war.

to find a nobler place for fine poetry which had else disappeared before the growing splendour of a newer Iliad. The *aristeia* of Diomede is probably due to the recitation of the Iliad at Argos, where the poem was very popular, and where the national hero must be made to play a prominent part. Thus his kingdom in the Catalogue is simply cut out of the empire of Agamemnon, and the hero himself is drawn a second Achilles. But in the later books (except the twenty-third) he almost completely disappears.

The arming and acts of Agamemnon, in the eleventh book, appear to me another such interpolation, unless most of the earlier books are, for in them the King of Men seems to be a weak, chicken-hearted creature, always counselling flight, or finding fault with his inferiors, and not the almost superhuman being he is here represented. In the same way I cannot believe that the acts of Patroclus are in the least consistent with his character and reputation all through the real *Achilleis*. He is nowhere spoken of as a wonderful hero, inferior only to Achilles in valour, but as an amiable second-rate personage, who keeps on good terms with everyone, and who obtains leave to bring out the Myrmidons to battle. I believe that in the original *Achilleis* he made but a poor diversion, and was presently slain in fair fight at the ships by the great Hector, as indeed the later books distinctly imply. But the subsequent poets who recited in the interests of Greek vanity made him slaughter Trojans all day, and at last robbed Hector of his glory by introducing Apollo and Euphorbus to help him.

§ 61. This brings me to the strongest and clearest inconsistency in the whole of our present Iliad—the character and position of Hector. It has been common among the English conservatives to boast of the wonderful harmony and accuracy of each character in the Iliad, and they quietly assume the whole of their facts as incontrovertible. But surely we need not trouble ourselves about their arguments, if we can deny and disprove their preliminary facts. That there are many subtle and striking harmonies I will not deny, but will assert what has hardly been yet touched upon in this country, that there are abundant and striking inconsistencies also. I have alluded

to some of these—the fear of Diomede on meeting Glaucus, the various pictures of Agamemnon, the sudden splendour of Patroclus ; but all these are nothing when we come to the case of Hector.

Critics, old and new, have felt the remarkable contradictions in the drawing of this famous hero, and yet none of them have ventured to suggest the real explanation. Even Mure and Mr. Gladstone confess that in our Iliad he is wholly inferior to his reputation ; ‘he is paid off,’ say they, ‘with generalities, while in actual encounter he is hardly equal to the second-rate Greek heroes.’ Yet why is he so important all through the plot of the poem ? Why is his death by Achilles made an achievement of the highest order ? Why are the chiefs who at one time challenge and worst him, at another quaking with fear at his approach ? Simply because in the original plan of the Iliad he *was* a great warrior, and because these perpetual defeats by Diomede and Ajax, this avoidance of Agamemnon, this swaggering and ‘hectoring’ which we now find in him, were introduced by the enlargers and interpolators, in order to enhance the merits of their favourites at his expense.

It seems to me certain that originally the Hector of the Iliad was really superior to all the Greeks except Achilles, that upon the retirement of the latter he made shorter work of them than the later rhapsodists liked to admit, that he soon burst the gates and appeared at the ships, that Patroclus was slain there after a brief diversion, and that in this way the whole catastrophe was very much more precipitated than we now find it. I suppose that even when Achilles returns to the field, these interpolations continue, that the battle of the gods comes from quite a different sort of poetry than the worldly epic, and that possibly the book of the games, and the last book, were added to the shorter plot. But it is likely that these additions must have been made very early, and by very splendid poets, for I cannot think with the Germans that such poetry as the ninth¹ and twenty-fourth books of the Iliad is one whit

¹ Sittl, while allowing its excellence (*L.G.* p. 91), points out various references implying late composition, such as to Egypt (381), to the Pythian Oracle (404), to Messenian towns (149), an Underworld-Zeus (457).

inferior to the best parts of the original poem. It also appears to me that the interpolators must have handled both the original poem and their additions or adaptations very freely ; for if my view of Hector be correct, they must have taken out achievements of his, and put in those of Greek heroes instead, at the same time adapting stories from the earlier history of the war to suit the altered time and circumstances.

§ 62. No doubt the strongest objection to this theory of the formation of our Iliad in most people's minds will be, not the groundless assertion about so many great poets having confined themselves to so short a period of the war, which I have set aside, but rather the assumption of the mere existence of more than one poet of such eminence, not to say of several, or even of a school of such splendour. I think this argument, which at first sight appears strong, depends upon a want of appreciation of the varying state of society, and its effects upon literature. There are ages, sometimes primitive, sometimes simple, where a school or habit of thinking will produce from a number of men what another age will only attain in high individual exceptions.

Here are two well-known instances. It is impossible for all our divines in the present day to produce prayers written in the pious English of our Book of Common Prayer. There is a certain depth of style, a certain 'sweet-smelling savour' about it which is almost unique in our language, and now unapproachable. But this book is not the work of a single man, or even perhaps of a few, but of a considerable number, who have nevertheless attained such unity or harmony in their way of thinking and of translating (from the Latin), that it is not easy to find the least inequality or falling off in any part. These men were not all Shakespeares and Miltons, but they were men who belonged to a school greater than any individual can ever be.

Let us consider another case not very dissimilar. The age of the Reformation produced in Germany an outburst of devotional poetry, which is preserved in the countless collections of old hymns still sung in the Protestant churches. Many of these hymns are assigned to well-known and celebrated

authors, such as Martin Luther, some to men otherwise unknown, others again are anonymous. But in literary merit there is a curious evenness about them. They do not differ in any way as the poetry of great and little poets does in our day. The same lofty tone, the same simple faith, the same pure language pervades them almost all. And yet both these examples are from ages very literary and developed as compared to the age of the epic bards in Greece. I conceive, therefore, that this evenness of production, this prevalence of a dominating tone, has made it possible for the work of several hands to coalesce into a great unity, in which the parts are all great, and, in the opinion of many, all worthy of the whole.

§ 63. But the destructive critics would not have recourse to this argument, because they deny the fact which I have assumed. Many Germans find parts of the *Iliad* wholly unworthy of the rest ; they will even tell you the line where a worse poet began, and where the greater poet takes up the thread again. This criticism is so completely subjective, so completely dependent upon the varying taste and judgment of the critic, that I forbear to enter upon it. Many passages which they think unworthy seem to me the finest poetry ; and if I were to select a specimen of what seems to me an evident and most disturbing interpolation, I should choose the lines Ω 527-52, which dilute a splendid scene, but which are nevertheless accepted as belonging to their present place by Aristarchus, and even by all the destructive critics of late days.

§ 64. The theory which I advocate is derived from that of Grote. But I do not think all the books which disturb the *Achilleis* belong to *one* other poem, or *Ilias*, as he does. I think they were separate lays, perhaps composed, perhaps adapted, for their place,¹ and that the part of Hector in the tragedy has been tampered with more seriously than he suspected. I further agree with the best destructive critics in Germany in thinking, that though the *Iliad* has a distinct plot, and though this plot was the direct cause of its several lays attaining to their present fame in the world, yet it is for splendid

¹ This theory has been adopted by M. Croiset, who nevertheless ranks me as a close follower of Grote, whom he criticises from this very point.

scenes, for touching episodes, for picturesque similes, that we love the Iliad most, and not for its economy or structure.

The successive events are sometimes so loosely connected that we come to suspect the commission of Peisistratus of having found many diverging versions, and of having co-ordinated them, in preference to suppressing them all save one. This is more particularly the case with the similes, with which the Iliad abounds. In spite of the ingenuity and the reverence of critics in defending them, these similes are often excessive and disturbing to the narrative, they often repeat the same facts with hardly any variation, and when we find two or three co-ordinated without adequate reason, it seems as if different reciting rhapsodes had composed them separately, and then the commission included them all in their comprehensive edition.¹

§ 65. These are the principal reflections which suggest themselves upon a critical survey of the Iliad. It would be idle in this place to rehearse again the centuries of praise which this immortal poem has received from all lovers of real poetry. While the historian and the grammarian will ever find there subjects of perplexity and doubt, every sound nature, from the schoolboy eager for life to the old man weary of it, will turn to its pages for deeply human pictures of excitement and of danger, of friendship and of sympathy. So purely and perfectly did the poet of that day mirror life and character, that he forgets his own existence, and leaves no trace of himself upon the canvas which he fills with heroes and their deeds. He paints what he conceives an ideal age, older and better than his own, but paints too naturally and too clearly from real life not to let us look through the ideal to the real beneath. The society thus revealed I have already elsewhere described.²

§ 66. We turn to consider the Odyssey. Though there was controversy in old days about the priority of the Iliad, it seems quite settled now³ that we must look upon the Odyssey as a later poem—how much later it is impossible to say. The limits assigned have varied from those who believed it the work of

¹ Cf. especially B 55-83.

² *Social Life in Greece*, chaps. i. and ii.

³ Schömann alone suggests (*Jahn's Jahrb.* vol. lxix. p. 130) that the Odyssey may have been the model for the framers of the Iliad.

the same author in old age, to those who place it two centuries later (as M. É. Burnouf does), owing to the difference of its plan and style. But, as Bonitz says,¹ if not composed in the old age of Homer, it was composed in the old age of Greek epic poetry, when the creative power was diminishing, but that of ordering and arranging had become more developed. The plot of the *Odyssey* is skilfully conceived, and on the whole artistically carried out, even though modern acuteness has found fault with its sutures. But critics seem agreed that the elements of the *Odyssey* were not short and disconnected lays, but themselves epics of considerable length, one on the Return of Odysseus, another on the adventures of Telemachus, and these the chief.

The drawing of the characters is perhaps less striking, but more consistent than in the *Iliad*. The whole composition is in fact tamer and more modern. The first faint pulse of public opinion apart from the ruling chiefs is beginning to be felt; the various elements of society are beginning to crystallise. The profession of poet, which was either unknown or unnoticed in the *Iliad*, is made one of importance, which the author strives consciously to magnify. Instead of constant battles, blood and wounds, we find that mercantile enterprise and the adventure of discovery are awakening. Luxury seems increased; and the esteem for chivalry retires before the esteem for prudence. The gods, who still constantly interfere in the life of men, are beginning to act upon more definite principles, and with somewhat less caprice and passion. The similes, with which the *Iliad* abounded, especially in its earlier books, become almost exceptional.

§ 67. It has been said, with a good deal of force, by the advocates of the unity of the two poems, that all these differences may be accounted for by the difference of the subjects; that in a poem of travel and adventure we must expect these very variations. But this seems rather the consequence than the cause of the altered feelings and

¹ Niese, *Entwick. d. H. Poesie* (p. 49), shows that the *Odyssey* knows the oriental fig, laurel, cypress, cedar, and palm; the *Iliad* only native forest trees. Cf. also (p. 155) the passages thoughtlessly copied from the *Iliad* in ϕ .

customs. With the blood and wounds, and the rude camp life of the *Iliad* before him, the poet who ventured upon a competition with so great a forerunner deliberately set himself to find contrasts, not only in treatment, but in plan. He may fairly claim to have surpassed the *Iliad* in the latter feature ; and even in the former, there is more charm about the *Odyssey* to a calmer and more reflective age, than about the fiercer *Iliad*. The Greeks of historical times, who were always trying to stimulate in their citizens military valour—a quality in which most Greeks were deficient enough—taught their children the warlike poem with this intent, and praised it above all others for this reason. Their approval was taken up by the grammarians, and handed on to modern critics ; but it seems to me doubtful whether it is not founded wholly upon the educational feeling among the Greeks. Unbiassed critics will now-a-days read the *Odyssey* oftener, and with greater pleasure. Most of the Germans think that there is a marked falling off in the second half of the poem ; that the character of the hero becomes exaggerated, and the narrative generally confused and injured by repetitions of the same idea. It would not be difficult to defend many of the points they have attacked, and to maintain that the trials of the unrecognised Odysseus in his own palace among the dissolute suitors are most artistically varied and prolonged in order to stir the reader with impatience for the thrilling catastrophe. It is generally agreed that there are spurious additions at the end. Again, Kirchhoff has argued that the double reproof of Penelope's incredulity by Telemachus and by Odysseus is not consistent, and shows signs of patching. Again—and this is no matter of detail—it is clear that there are in the poem two distinct reasons to account for the non-recognition of Odysseus on his return home : first, the natural changes of twenty years' toil and hardship ; secondly, the miraculous transformation effected by Athene for the purpose of disguise.

These and other similar objections to the original unity of the *Odyssey* are not likely to occur to the general reader, or to disturb him, seeing that they had never occurred to the acutest critics before Kirchhoff. Thus Sengebusch, whose writings

(so far as they are known to me) date prior to Kirchhoff's book, is very severe on the Chorizontes, and ridicules all their attempts to prove the Odyssey younger than the Iliad, or made up of parts various in age. His arguments, however, though very strong against the minor points urged, do not touch the later and more serious attack.¹ Professor Geddes is content, with Wolf and Grote, to assume the unity of the Odyssey as unquestioned, and the whole of his Homeric theory is based upon this assumption. These critics have the authority of Aristarchus. But his assumption of the unity of the Iliad must have vitiated his great argument about its anticipations of the Odyssey. If several hands contributed to each poem, it was certain that some of the later Ilian poets knew the Odyssey, at least in part; nay, it is very likely that the same poets contributed to both, as has been shown by the researches of Professor Geddes. Hence, harmonies of this kind between the Iliad and Odyssey would only prove a gradual construction of both in a school with fixed traditions and intent on avoiding manifest contradictions.

§ 68. It may be fairly expected that I should not conclude the subject without giving a brief summary of the general results attained by this long controversy.

We may assume it as certain that there existed in Ionia schools or fraternities of epic rhapsodists who composed and recited heroic lays at feasts, and often had friendly contests in these recitations. The origin of these recitations may be sought in northern Greece, from which the fashion migrated in early days to Asia Minor. We may assume that these singers became popular in many parts of Greece, and that they wandered from

¹ His most ingenious point is his escape from the difficulty about the *Kimmerians*, whose mention in λ 14 is held to prove that that passage was composed after the appearance of the nation in Asia Minor, *circ.* 700 B.C. Sengebusch notes that there were *Χειμέριοι* in Epirus; that Aristarchus probably on this account rejected the variant *Κεββερίων*, but preserved the Ionic form *Κιμμερίων*, as the home of the legend came from that country; finally, that this very passage suggested the name which the Ionian Greeks gave to the devastating invaders who overran Asia Minor, and who were not really so called. Cf. *Fahn's Jahrbücher*, vol. lxvii. p. 414. But all this seems *argutius quam verius*.

court to court glorifying the heroic ancestors of the various chiefs. One among them, called Homer, was endowed with a genius superior to the rest, and struck out a plot capable of nobler and larger treatment. It is likely that this superiority was not recognised at the time, and that he remained all his life a singer like the rest, a wandering minstrel, possibly poor and blind. The listening public gradually stamped his poem with their approval, they demanded its frequent recitation, and so this Homer began to attain a great posthumous fame. But when this fame led people to inquire into his life and history, it had already passed out of recollection, and men supplied by fables what they had forgotten or neglected. The rhapsodists, however, then turned their attention to expanding and perfecting his poem, which was greatly enlarged and called the *Iliad*. In doing this they had recourse to the art of writing, which seems to have been in use when Homer framed his poem, but which was certainly employed when the plan was enlarged with episodes. The home of the original Homer seems to have been about Smyrna, and in contact with both Æolic and Ionic legends. His date is quite uncertain; it need not be placed before 800 B.C., and is perhaps later, but not after 700 B.C.¹

When the greatness of the *Iliad* had been already discovered, another rhapsodist of genius conceived the idea of constructing a similar but contrasted epic from the stories about Odysseus and Telemachus, and so our *Odyssey* came into existence—a more carefully planned story, but not so fresh and original as the older *Iliad*. Both poets lived at the time when the individual had not asserted himself superior to the clan or brotherhood of bards to which he belonged, and hence their personality is lost behind the general features of the school, and the

¹ This is now supported by Fick on linguistic grounds in his remarkable *Odyssee in ihrer urspr. Form* (Bezz. Beiträge, 1883). Niese (op. cit. p. 226), who makes Homer the real father of all Greek epic poetry, makes this date a century earlier, on the ground that the oldest cyclic poets, notably Arctinus and Callinus, directly depend from him. But who will tell us with any certainty that Arctinus lived at the first Olympiad? This date may be a century, or two centuries wrong, for all we know. On Callinus cf. below, p. 176.

legendary character of their subjects. An age of rapid and original production is not unlikely to produce this result. Thus Shakespeare, among a crowd of playwrights, and without any prestige, did not become famous till the details of his life were well-nigh forgotten. The controversies concerning his plays have many points of analogy with the disputes about Homer.

When the name of Homer became famous, all epic compositions pretended to be his work, and he gradually became the hero *eponymos* of the schools of rhapsodists. Hence the first critics began by disallowing the Homeric origin of various inferior and later compositions. This process had in later classical times gone so far as to reject all but the Iliad and Odyssey. With an attempt to reject even the Odyssey, ancient scepticism paused. No Greek critic ever thought of denying that each poem was the conception and work of a single mind, and of a mind endowed with exceptional genius. The modern attempt of the Wolfian school to prove them mere conglomerates has failed. They have proved that there was extensive interpolation, but all attempts to disengage the original nucleus have failed.

§ 68*. It occurs to me that I ought to say something in answer to a natural objection which may be made against the recent date assigned to the Odyssey in this volume. If this poem did not receive its present form till near 700 B.C., how is it possible to account for its vague and fabulous notions about the geography of the West? For if Syracuse and Naxos and Catana, and many other flourishing Greek cities, had been founded from 735 B.C. onward, surely the fables of Polyphemus, of the oxen of the sun, of Scylla and Charybdis, and the like, must have been then already long exploded.

My answer to this objection is twofold. In the first place, recent researches have shown the geography of the Odyssey, not only as regards the West, but as regards the very home of Odysseus, to be so vague and inaccurate, that we must regard it as consciously imaginary in the poet's mind. He was no primitive bard painting facts so far as he knew them accurately, and filling in the rest from his imagination and from legend, but a deliberate romancer, who did not care to reproduce tame

reality, even where he could have easily ascertained it. I know that some amateur scholars, like Mr. Gladstone and Dr. Schliemann, will not agree with me, but I will merely refer the reader to the latest and ablest survey of Homeric geography in Mr. Bunbury's *Geography of the Ancients* (especially vol. i. ch. iii. § 3), where he will see my statement amply corroborated. Not even Ithaca, not even the Ionian islands, not even the neighbouring coasts are described with any approach to their real features. When Telemachus is described starting in a chariot from Pylos, and driving within two days to Sparta with his companion,¹ the poet leaves us to imagine either a smooth plain, or an easy high road along which horses can gallop. Anyone who has seen the country between the two places will know how utterly absurd this notion is. And are we to imagine any high roads at all through the gorges and defiles between Messene and Laconia? At no period of Greek history down to the present day was such a journey possible. It follows that we cannot infer the historical or geographical knowledge of this age from a poet who deliberately drew his pictures, even of Greece, from fancy, and not from observation.

It is therefore likely that this geographical vagueness was the result of an intentional archaïcising, of an affected ignorance, in the clever rhapsodist. If the ignorance had been confined to the far West, and in that case only, could we explain it by the antiquity of the poet and the narrow horizon of his geographical knowledge.

But even if this were not so, I could meet the objection in another way. The received dates for the foundation of the Greek colonies are all derived from the Sicilian *Archæologia* of Thucydides at the opening of his sixth book. All these dates were evidently borrowed from Antiochus of Syracuse,² and we need not extend to this old logographer the superstitious reverence generally accorded to every statement of Thucydides. I need only assume the ordinary motive, that Dionysius would not compose his history without glorifying his native Syracuse, then the leading city among all the western Hellenic colonies.

¹ γ 491, sq.

² This is now generally admitted—e.g., by Busolt, *G.G.* i. 241, note.

He was prevented by the ancient temple of Apollo *Archegetes* at Naxos, and the customs attached to it, from asserting the greater antiquity of Syracuse to this town, but he placed his native city next, and by the smallest possible interval, and then dated all the other colonies with reference to Syracuse as really the capital of Sicily. This is manifest from Thucydides' account.

But how did Antiochus fix the date of the founding of Syracuse? Surely by no careful reasoning backward from later and clearer history, by no examination of existing records, but rather by reasoning downward from an assumed date of Temenus to Archias the founder, who was the eleventh in descent from that hero. This would give 330 years from Temenus to Archias' maturity. Let us note that Pheidon of Argos was for the very same reason misdated to 747 B.C.

Starting, I believe, from this *à priori* determination, Antiochus seems to have reversed the natural history of Greek colonisation in the West, for the sake of glorifying Syracuse. Other legends tell of Archias helping the founder of Corcyra; they tell of his helping, on his way to Sicily, the Greek settlers in southern Italy.¹ Surely this indicates what really happened. Greek settlers first occupied Corcyra, then they pushed on to Italy, and, avoiding the barren shore north of Otranto, found rich plains about the Liris, of which Archilochus speaks (I think) as of new discoveries. Thence they found their way to Sicily.² I do not believe that this latter island was colonised till after 700 B.C., and hold that the whole Sicilian chronology found in all our Greek histories rests on the imaginary basis laid down by Antiochus.

§ 69. It is indeed sad that the historian of Greek literature must devote all his attention to these dry discussions when he comes to treat of the most charming among Greek books, the oldest and the most perfect romance in European society. All the characters of the *Odyssey* live before us with the most

¹ Cf. Müller, *F.H.G.* i. p. 183, on the extant frags. of Antiochus.

² The earliest sea-battle known to Thucydides was between Corinthians and Corcyraeans about 660 B.C., probably concerning this very question, the route to Sicily, which Corcyra tried to monopolise.

wonderful clearness. Even the old servants, and the dogs, are life-portraits ; and Plato has not attained to a more delicate shading of character than may be found in the drawing of the various ladies, or of the insolent suitors, who appear upon the scene. When we hear that Sophocles took whole dramas from the Odyssey, we rather wonder that Euripides did not do so also ; and we cannot allege the imaginary reason in Aristotle's *Poetic*, that the plot was too simple and well-articulated to afford more than one drama. For it is really very complex and ingenious. The gradual approach of the catastrophe after Odysseus' return in disguise is wonderfully exciting, and thrills the mind at the twentieth perusal as at the first. The portrait of the hero is an essentially Greek ideal, with the ingrained weaknesses of the Hellenic character fully expressed in him, yet, on the whole, superior to the fierce and obstinate Achilles. But the outspoken admission of guile and deceit in Odysseus produced a gradual degradation of his character in the cyclic poets, in Epicharmus, and in tragedy, while Achilles escaped. In fact, *educational* tendencies censured the general inclination to knavery, and exalted the somewhat unusual quality of physical courage, wherever they were found described in the Bible of the Greeks. Nevertheless, Odysseus was the Jacob of the nation, the real type and patriarch of the Ionic race.

I will conclude by pointing out a peculiarly poetic trait in the character of Penelope, which seems to me to speak a long world-experience, and very little of that buoyant simplicity of early times and primitive manners which is usually lauded in Homer. Nothing is at first sight stranger than the obstinate scepticism of Penelope at the end of the story. She who had for years sought out and given credence to every strolling vagabond's report about her husband, cannot persuade herself, when he actually returns, to accept him ! And yet, nowhere has any modern poet given us truer and deeper psychology. To a nature like Penelope's the longing for her husband had become so completely the occupation of her life—'grief filled the room up of her absent lord'—had so satisfied and engrossed her thoughts that, on his return, all her life seemed empty, all her occupation gone, and she was in that blank amazement

which paralyses the mind. For after a great and sudden loss, we know not how to prepare ourselves for a change, however happy, in our daily state, and our minds at first refuse to accept the loss of griefs which have become almost dear to us from their familiarity. Such a conception we might expect from Menander or from Shakespeare. In Homer it is indeed passing strange.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CYCLIC POETS AND THE BATRACHO-MYO-MACHIA.—

ÆSOP AND BABRIUS.

§ 70. It is not the plan of this book to notice the lost works in Greek literature, except so far as it is necessary for the understanding of the remaining treasures. Those who desire to see all that can be said on the obscure subject of the cyclic poets may consult Welcker's *Epischer Cyclus*, where the greater part of three volumes is devoted to the discussion of notices and fragments in themselves of little value, and to an estimate of the genius of poets whom the ancients neglected or despised. The few facts elicited by his very long discussion are easily summed up.

It is a salient fact in Greek literature that originality in each kind of composition was exhausted when the next in order sprang up. Thus, the long period which elapsed from the first outburst of epic poetry to the rise of iambic and lyric poetry, as well as the earlier epochs of these species, was filled with a series of epic writers who treated subjects similar to those of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. But we are told that no later poet whatever covered this particular ground, owing, it is said, to the great excellence of the real Homer, who far distanced and silenced all competition. It would be safer to assert that all the poets who did sing of these subjects were either embodied in the Homeric poems, or, if not, were immediately thrown aside and forgotten. I have already shown (p. 86) that the earlier lays discernible in the *Iliad* were by no means confined to the tenth year of the war, but may have suited any period subsequent to the landing of the Greeks, or before the death of Hector. To us, however, no separate poet remains who is known to have trodden on the ground of Homer.

It was once commonly believed that the remaining epic poets equally avoided touching upon one another, that they composed their poems upon a fixed chronological plan, each resuming where the other had finished, and so completing an account of what is called the Epic cycle, from the birth of Aphrodite in the *Cypria* down to the conclusion of the *Nostoi*, or *Telegonia*, of Euegammon. But it seems clearly made out now that no such fixed system of poems existed; that the authors, widely separated in date and birthplace, were no corporation with fixed traditions; that they did overlap in subject, and repeat the same legends; and that the epic cycle does not merely mean a cycle of *poems*, but a cycle of *legends*,¹ arranged by the grammarians, who illustrated them by a selection of poems, or parts of poems, including, of course, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and then such other epics as told the whole story of the Theban and Trojan wars, down to the conclusion of the heroic age. When the story was well circulated in *Bilderchroniken* and prose extracts, the inferior poems were forgotten.

§ 71. We owe chiefly to the summary of the grammarian Proclus,² which is preserved to us, the following list of the poems and subjects. (i) The *Cypria*, in early days attributed to Homer himself, then denied to him by Herodotus (ii. 117) and other sound critics on account of variations from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in its legends, was generally cited anonymously, as in the Schol. Ven. on the *Iliad*. Later on, Athenæus and Proclus speak of Stasinus, or Hegesias, or Hegesinus, as the author. It was called *Cypria*, either because the author of the poem came from Cyprus, or because it celebrated the Cyprian goddess Aphrodite, and detailed from the commencement her action in the Trojan war. This fact of itself shows a standpoint quite foreign to the *Iliad*. The poem was, however, an introduction to the *Iliad*, telling a vast number of myths, and leading the reader from the first causes of the war up to the tenth year of its duration. It is easy to see that such a

¹ κυκλικός in the Scholl. *Iliad.*, in Callimachus, and even in Horace, means vulgar or commonplace. The technical meaning is much later. Cf. Couat, *Poésie Alex.* p. 503. Cf. the learned discussion of Mr. D. B. Monro in *Hell. Jour.* vol. iv., and Sittl, *G. L.* i. p. 169.

² Cf. Dindorf's *Schol. Græc. in Iliadem*, vol. i. (Pref.) p. xxxi, sq.

vast subject loosely connected must have failed to afford the artistic unity which underlies the course of the *Iliad*. (2) The *Æthiopis*, in five books, by Arctinus of Miletus, the oldest certainly known epic poet, who is generally placed about the 1st Olympiad (776 B.C.),¹ and called a pupil of Homer. This poem reached from the death of Hector to that of Achilles, and told of the arrival of the Amazons and the *Æthiopians* to aid Troy. It was even tacked on to the *Iliad* by a modification of the last line. Achilles was the central figure of the poem, and appears to have been treated with breadth and power. He slays Penthesilea, and then feels a pang of remorse on beholding her beauty. This is ridiculed by Thersites, whom he kills in a fit of passion. Antilochus, who seems in some sort to have been the Patroclus of the poem, is slain by Memnon while endeavouring to save his father, Nestor. Achilles then slays Memnon, and is himself slain, in his pursuit of the Trojans, by Paris. The contest for the arms of Achilles, and the suicide of Ajax, concluded the *Æthiopis*, if, indeed, the poem called the *Sack of Ilium*, by the same author, in two books, was not originally connected with the *Æthiopis*. (3) But the arrangers of the mythical cycle preferred, on the events immediately preceding the sack of the city, a poem of Lesches called the *Little Iliad*, by Pausanias also the *Sack of Ilium*. This Lesches was a Lesbian,² and contemporary with Archilochus (about Ol. 30). He related, apparently in more of a chronicler's than a poet's spirit, the events from the contest about Achilles' arms to the actual fall of Troy. Odysseus was his principal hero. (4) The *Nostoi*, in five books, by Agias of Trœzen, but often quoted anonymously. He sang of the adventures of the heroes apart from Odysseus, especially the Atreidæ, and described the regions of the dead in a passage referred to by Pausanias. (5) The *Telegonia*, by Eugammon of Cyrene, who is placed about the 53rd Ol. He described the adventures of Odysseus, Telemachus, and of Telegonus, son of Odysseus and Circe, and thus completed the Trojan cycle. It is hardly necessary to give similar details about the

¹ According to Sittl, *op. cit.* p. 174, probably earlier!

² Sittl argues that as Hellanicus ascribes the poem to the Spartan Kinæthion, no Lesbian such as Lesches could have been the author (*L. G.* p. 176).

Theban cycle, which has no interest to us except that the tragic poets borrowed largely from it.¹

§ 72. The extant fragments of these poems are so trifling—some sixty lines—as to afford us no adequate means of judging their authors' merits.² They are all quoted in Welcker's *Epischer Cyclus*, an ingenious attempt to vindicate the old cyclic poets against the systematic neglect or even disparagement of classical days—I mean the neglect of them as literature, though they were the great mine from which the tragic poets drew their plots. On the other hand, Colonel Mure, in his excellent second volume, has put together all that can be learned from analysing the extant fragments, and has based an adverse verdict strictly on two famous judgments preserved to us in the *Poetic*, of which this is the substance. Aristotle compares the nature of the *unity* requisite for history, which he calls merely chronological, and that for poetry, which must be logical; nor is it enough that the action should be laid in one division of time, or centred about one hero. He further distinguishes in poetry the epic and the tragic unity, of which the former is the larger, and admits of episodes, while the latter is shorter and stricter. But in speaking generally of the unity of story in both epic and tragic poetry, he asserts that almost all epic poets had been content with a mechanical unity, whereas Homer, with superior tact, whether instinctive or acquired, had chosen subjects of which the parts are easily comprehended and naturally grouped under a real and logical unity. In this he contrasts him especially with the authors of the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad*, and observes that only one, or at most two, tragedies can be derived from the *Iliad*, or from the *Odyssey*, whereas many can be derived (and indeed were derived) from the *Cypria*, and at least eight, which he mentions, from the *Little Iliad*. Unfortunately, this latter passage in the *Poetic* (c. 23) is hopelessly corrupt, and conflicts not only with the plain facts of the history of

¹ The principal poems of which we have any report are the epic of Œdipus, ascribed to Kinæthon, then an old *Thebais* by an unknown poet, followed by the *Epigoni* of Antimachus of Teos. The capture of Œchalia, and the epics on the Minyans, lie outside this series, but akin to it.

² The newest edition of them is Kinkel's—*Ep. Græc. Fragg.*, Leipzig, 1877; we have also Düntzer's.

tragedy, but with other statements in this very treatise. It is said to be absurd (c. 18, § 4) to work the whole Iliad into one tragedy; it is further asserted (c. 27, § 13) that from any epic poem many tragedies may be formed—an obvious fact, and in accordance with actual literary history. No doubt ingenious critics have found means of reconciling these inconsistencies; they make Aristotle speak at one time of the central plot only of the Homeric poems; at another of the whole poems, including the episodes; they emend the text, and by these and other contrivances devise a theory which they endeavour to force upon the facts.

I prefer to set aside the criticisms of the *Poetic*, either as not being the genuine text and sense of Aristotle, or else, as showing in that great man such a traditional reverence for the Homeric poems as made him an unsafe critic when they were concerned. The unity of the Iliad is not adequately sustained or highly artistic. Many tragedies could be, and have been, legitimately constructed from it. As far as we can see, the poem of Arctinus was similarly grouped about a central figure—Achilles, whose death was the climax—but introduced important and striking episodes. It is therefore better to refrain from using the so-called authority of Aristotle in this matter.

Colonel Mure, however, arguing from this, and from the low esteem shown by the rest of our authorities, degrades the epic cycle to a series of metrical chronicles maintaining no proper unity, and dealing, moreover, not unfrequently in low and disgusting details. He is no doubt right in showing that the portraiture of many of the tragic heroes, especially of Menelaus and Ulysses, which is so different from that of Homer, comes from the cyclic poems; when he asserts that the poets put themselves forward too prominently, as compared with the self-effacement of Homer, he says what is not provable from our fragments.¹ Welcker and Bernhardt place Arctinus above the others. They attribute to him the origination of the Amazonian and Ethiopian legends; they see in his fragments seriousness and tragic gloom as compared with the lighter and less

¹ Sittl (*L.G.* p. 171) thinks we can infer their style and matter from the later portions of the Iliad and Odyssey, and makes some acute remarks on probable interpolations from this point of view.

dignified Lesches. Beyond this cautious thinkers are now slow to venture. The rest of the cyclic poets are hidden from us in a gloom which only the discovery of a new MS. may some day dispel. Even Quintus Smyrnæus, whose *Posthomerica* cover much of the ground occupied by them, seems not to have used them diligently, or to have reproduced their treatment.

§ 73. The present place seems the most proper to give an account of the *Batracho-myo-machia* (often cited as *μυομαχία* for shortness), or 'Battle of the Frogs and Mice,' which is the only mock epic remaining to us in early Greek literature, and which, though it excited little attention of old, has given rise to many translations and imitations among the Italians and French since the Renaissance. The poem, as it now exists, consists of 316 hexameters, and though far removed from the style and power of Homer, to whom it was generally attributed in uncritical days, has more merit than is conceded to it by recent commentators. By some authorities Pigres, the son of Artemisia, to whom the *Margites* is also ascribed, is named as the author—a theory adopted by Baumeister, and to which I should unhesitatingly subscribe, as the most unlikely tradition in the world to be false, were not Pigres already reported the author of the *Margites*. This obscure poet may have been suggested by critics who felt that the work was not Homer's, and could find no more likely person than the accredited author of another sportive poem, once called Homeric also. This consideration makes the authorship of Pigres not improbable, but rather doubtful. There is evidence—from the familiar allusion to writing at the opening, from the mention of the cock (v. 193), from the Attic use of the article, and the frequent shortening of vowels before mute and liquid (*Atticæ correptiones*, as they are called)—that in the present form the poem cannot date from a time much earlier than Æschylus, and that it is, besides, corrupted and interpolated considerably by far later hands.

The plot is witty, and not badly constructed. A mouse, after escaping from the pursuit of a cat, is slaking its thirst at a pond, when it is accosted by a frog, King Puff-cheek, the son of Peleus (in the sense of muddy), who asks it to come and see his home and habits. The mouse consents, but the sudden

appearance of an otter terrifies the frog, and makes him dive, leaving the mouse to perish, after sundry epic exclamations and soliloquies. A bystanding mouse brings the tidings to the tribe, who forthwith prepare for war, and arm themselves, sending a formal declaration to the frogs. The deliberations of Zeus and Athena,¹ as to what part they will take in the war, are really comic,

¹ vv. 160-200:

*Ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας ὄπλοισ ἐνέδυσεν ἅπαντας.
φύλλοις μὲν μαλαχῶν κνήμας ἕας ἀμφεκάλυψαν,
θώρηκας δ' εἶχον καλῶν χλοερῶν ἀπὸ σεύτλων,
φύλλα δὲ τῶν κραμβῶν εἰς ἀσπίδας εἰς ἤσκησαν,
ἔγχος δ' ὀξύσχοινος ἐκάστω μακρὸς ἀρήρει,
καὶ τὰ κέρα κοχλιῶν λεπτῶν ἐκάλυπτε κάρηνα.
φραξάμενοι δ' ἔστησαν ἐπ' ὄχθης ὑψηλῇσιν,
σεῖοντες λόγχας, θυμοῦ δ' ἐμπληντο ἕκαστος.

Ζεὺς δὲ θεοὺς καλέσας εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα,
καὶ πολέμου πληθὺν δείξας, κρατεροὺς τε μαχητάς,
πολλοὺς καὶ μεγάλους ἡδ' ἔγχεα μακρὰ φέροντας,
υἱὸς Κενταύρων στρατὸς ἔρχεται ἡὲ Γιγάντων,
ἡδὺν γελῶν ἐρέεινε· τίνες βατράχοισιν ἀρωγὸι
ἦ μυστὶν ἀθανάτων ; καὶ Ἀθηναίην προσέειπεν·

*ὦ θύγατερ, μυστὶν ἦ ῥ' ἐπαλεξήσουσα πορεύσῃ ;
καὶ γάρ σου κατὰ νηδὺν αἰεὶ σκιρτῶσιν ἅπαντες,
κνίσσῃ τερπόμενοι καὶ ἐδέσμασιν ἐκ θυσιῶν.

*Ὡς ἄρ' ἔφη Κρονίδης· τὸν δὲ προσέειπεν Ἀθῆνη·
ὦ πάτερ, οὐκ ἂν πώποτ' ἐγὼ μυστὶ τειρομένοισιν
ἐλθοίην ἐπαρωγός, ἐπεὶ κακὰ πολλὰ μ' ἔοργαν,
στέμματα βλάπτοντες καὶ λύχνους εἵνεκ' ἐλαίου.
τοῦτο δέ μου λίην ἔδακε φρένας, οἷά μ' ἔρεξαν.
πέπλον μου κατέτρωξαν, ὃν ἐξύφανα καμουῖσα
ἐκ ῥοδάνης λεπτῆς, καὶ στήμονα λεπτὸν ἔνησα,
τρώγλας τ' ἐμποίησαν· ὃ δ' ἡπητής μοι ἐπέστη,
καὶ πρᾶσσει με τόκον· τούτου χάριν ἐξώργισμαι.
χρησαμένη γὰρ ὕφανα, καὶ οὐκ ἔχω ἀνταποδοῦναι.
ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὥς βατράχοισιν ἀρηγέμεν οὐκ ἐβέλθω.
εἰσὶ γὰρ οὐδ' αὐτοὶ φρένας ἐμπεδοὶ· ἀλλὰ με πρῶν
ἐκ πολέμου ἀνιοῦσαν, ἐπεὶ λίην ἐκοπώθην,
ὑπνου δευομένην, οὐκ εἴασαν θορυβοῦντες,
οὐδ' ὀλίγον καμῦσαι· ἐγὼ δ' αὔπνιος κατεκείμεν,
τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀλγοῦσα, ἕως ἐβόησεν ἀλέκτωρ.
ἀλλ' ἄγε, παυσώμεσθα, θεοί, τοῦτοισιν ἀρήγειν,
μή κέ τις ἡμείων τρωθῇ βέλει δξυόεντι,
μή τις καὶ λόγχῃφι τυπῇ δέμας ἡὲ μαχαίρῃ·
εἰσὶ γὰρ ἀγχέμαχοι, καὶ εἰ θεὸς ἀντίος ἔλθοι·
πάντες δ' οὐρανόθεν τερπώμεθα δῆριν ὀρώντες

and a very clever parody on Homer. Then follows quite an epic battle, with deliberate inconsistencies, such as the reappearance of several heroes already killed. The frogs are worsted, and the victorious mice are not even deterred by the thunder of Zeus, but are presently put to flight by the appearance of an army of crabs to assist the defeated frogs.

The German destructive critics think the extant poem was put together from fragments of earlier mock epics of the same kind. But of this we have no evidence. The opening invocation is that of a Hesiodic bard (addressing the choir of the Muses from Helicon), and not of a Homerid. Hence it is not impossible that the idea of such a mock epic originated in Bœotia (where both frogs and mice must always have been particularly abundant), and was intended by the didactic and practical school of Hesiod as a moral reproof of the lighter and more superstitious Ionic singers. But this is only a conjecture; the general complexion of the poem, as we have it, being certainly Attic. The earliest allusion to it in Greek literature seems to be a sarcasm of Alexander the Great, quoted by Plutarch in his *Life* (cap. 28). The Alexandrian critics are silent about it, so far as we know. Several Roman poets under the Empire—Statius, Martial, and Fulgentius—allude to it as a relaxation of the great author of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

Bibliographical. Our MSS. seem all copied from one archetype of the Byzantine period, ignorantly and carelessly written. From this Baumeister has shown two families of MSS. to be derived, one represented by two Bodleian (cod. Baroc. 46 and 64), which are by no means the oldest, but which are tolerably faithful copies of the archetype, even in its blunders. The other family is very numerous, and comprises our oldest MSS., viz. the Bodleian cod. Baroc. 50 (fol. 358) of the tenth century, the Laurentian (Plut. xxxii. 3) of the eleventh, a Palatine (at Heidelberg) of the twelfth, and an Ambrosian (i. 4, super) of the thirteenth. There are many of the fourteenth century. These are deliberately interpolated and emended by scribes endeavouring to restore or improve the original. Some twenty have been collated, and at least thirty more still await investigation. This family of MSS. shows a decomposition of the

text almost without parallel, as may be seen from a glance at Baumeister's edition. Most of them have copious scholia and notes by Byzantine grammarians. Those of Moschopulos, if they indeed exist (cf. Baumeister, p. 10), are as yet unpublished. The earliest translation is by Sommariva, dated Verona, 1470, but the date is rejected as spurious by Giuliani, the learned historian of Veronese typography. There is a translation into low Greek by Demetrius Zenas, in 1534 (reprinted in Ilgen, and by Mullach, Berlin, 1837), which shows the text he used to be not different from ours. The book was first printed, in alternate black and red lines, at Venice in 1486¹—the first Greek classic ever printed—and this very rare edition was imitated (only as to colours) by Mich. Mattaire, in his edition with notes (London, 1721). The Florentine Homer of 1488 is the basis of most following editions, e.g. those of Ilgen (with the Hymns, 1796), Matthiæ, F. A. Wolf, who asserted our text to be a mere conglomerate, Bothe, Frank, and, lastly, Baumeister (Göttingen, 1852), whose account of the text seems very complete, except that he does not specify the age of any of the MSS. which he discusses.² Since the Renaissance the poem has excited a good deal of attention, Melanchthon and others imagining a hidden political or moral import under its parody. There is a spirited old translation by George Chapman, reprinted by J. Russell Smith (London, 1858).

§ 74. The 'beast-epic' we have been considering suggests naturally a more general inquiry into the occurrence of beast-fables in Greek literature. This form of imagination was, on the whole, foreign to the Greeks, and there are many indications that the supposed father of fable, Æsop, was a Syrian, Phrygian, or Æthiopian. Some have argued that he was an Egyptian. Nevertheless the fable, originally called *αἶνος*, though not fre-

¹ Per *Leonicum Cretensem*. The grammar of Lascaris, the Milan Æsop, and a Greek and Latin Psalter of 1481 are the only earlier books (not quotations) in Greek type which I can find. They are all to be seen in the Althorp library.

² It now appears (according to Sittl, p. 153) that he has chosen the worst, and that we may expect from Ludwich a very different edition, based on a Laurentian MS.

quent, is found at intervals in various kinds of Greek poetry. We have in Hesiod the fable of the falcon and dove ; in Stesichorus, that of the horse and his rider ; in Archilochus, stories about the fox, and many metaphors from beast-life ; in the elder Simonides, sketches of character derived from various animals ; in Æschylus, the Libyan fable which Byron has so well adapted in his lines on *Kirke White*.

Though Hesiod was named as the earliest poet who used this form of apologue, its invention was systematically attributed to Æsop, an obscure and perhaps mythical figure, whose historical reality has been generally rejected since the searching article on this subject by Welcker.¹ Nevertheless, Herodotus speaks of him as a slave of Iadmon at Samos in the sixth century. Aristophanes and Plato both speak of Æsopic jokes as a distinct kind of fun, and Aristotle tells of his murder by the Delphians having been atoned with great difficulty by the special command of the oracle. Herodotus says that the atonement offered two generations after the murder by the Delphians was claimed by Iadmon, the grandson of his owner. It was added that Æsop came to life again, owing to his piety.² In spite of these definite allusions, the list of which is by no means complete, we cannot fix either the age or nationality of this strange personage, whom later art represented a hideous and deformed creature, perhaps to indicate his nearer approach to the lower animals, and his peculiar sympathy for their habits. Such is the conception of the famous statue now in the Villa Albani at Rome.

This side of literature, however, long remained a mere amusement in society, or among the ignorant classes, nor can we regard such a literary work as Aristophanes' *Birds* or the *Myomachia* in any other light than a most exceptional

¹ *Rhein. Mus.* vi. 366, sq. Flach (*G.L.* 577, sq.) argues at great length, and with much ability, for the historical character of these notices, though he strangely rejects the story of the murder at Delphi. On the whole, I now accept his view that Æsop was the slave of Iadmon in the sixth century B.C.

² Cf. Herodotus, ii. 134 ; Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1258, 1437, and schol. ; Plato, *Phædo*, 60 D, Aristotle, *Frag.* 445 ; Æschylus, *Frag.* 129.

product.¹ When original power was failing, and men began to collect the works of their predecessors, we hear that Demetrius Phalereus made the first written *corpus* of these popular stories, no doubt in their rude prose form. Then we find that Callimachus sought to give them a literary tone by adapting them in choliambic metre, no doubt the best metrical form which could have been selected.

But so little prominence did he give to this side of his multiform literary activity, that Babrius, who came much later, was justly regarded as the originator of the metrical fable. This remarkable author, of unknown date,² and not cited by early grammarians, was only known by Suidas' fragmentary quotations until the discovery of two MSS. of his work at Mount Athos by Minas, about 1840. The name of the discoverer naturally suggested doubts as to the genuineness of the discovery, but according to Dindorf (*Philol.* xvii. pp. 321, sq.) there is no mistake about the first; the second is probably a compilation by Minas from pre-existing fragments. Both texts were printed by Sir G. Lewis (Oxon. 1846; London, 1859), but Boissonade's (Paris, 1844) is the *editio princeps*, and Lachmann's the best, at least of the former MS. The literary merit of Babrius is very considerable, though he does not belong to the classical period. As for the Æsopic fables, they were variously collected in later days, and are preserved in many MSS. throughout Europe. The collection of the monk Planudes, with a life of Æsop, was printed among the very earliest Greek books (Milan, Bonus Accursius, perhaps as early as 1479); the latest is Klotz's (Leipzig, 1810). There are besides de Furia's, Coraes' and Schneider's collections, all printed about 1810. There is now an edition of Babrius by Mr. W. G. Rutherford, which may be regarded as final, and an unusual specimen of scholarship in the England of to-day.

¹ Our early allusions seem to distinguish Libyan, Sybaritic, Syrian, &c from Æsopic, but ultimately λόγος αἰσώπειος becomes the recognised expression for a beast-fable.

² Otto Crusius (*Leipzig. Stud.* ii. 2, p. 125) has argued that he was a Roman, and that he lived in the 3rd cent. A.D.

CHAPTER VII.

THE DIDACTIC EPOS. HESIOD—THE EARLY PHILOSOPHERS.

§ 75. GREAT as is the divergence of critics about the Homeric poems, it seems almost unanimity when we come to study the modern Hesiodic literature. Every possible theory, every possible critical judgment has been upheld and refuted; so that, after toiling through wildernesses of German books, and tracts, and programs, one comes to the conclusion that nothing has been gained, nothing proved, and that the field is still open to plain common sense, as well as to new flights of fancy.

The home of this distinct kind of epic poetry, called *Didactic*, because of its occasionally moral and instructive tone, was not originally¹ a sea-coast, with bays, and promontories, and rocky islands, but the inland of Bœotia, surrounded on all sides by mountain chains, with rich arable soil in the plain, and light pastures on the higher slopes; with great sedgy sheets of still water about the lowlands, and streams tumbling from the hills. It was a climate, says the poet of the *Works and Days*, bad in winter, trying in summer, never good; and this he says, contrasting it, I suppose, with what his father told him, or what he himself remembered of Æolic Kyme, upon the rich shore of Asia Minor, where the climate of old was wonderful even to the Greeks. But he has certainly exaggerated the faults of the weather, and said nothing of the richness of the soil.² Yet no doubt the extremes of cold and heat were

¹ I say *originally*, because Bergk follows the traditions of the poet's death, so far as to hold his ultimate settlement at Naupactus, and to call his school the Locrian School, of which the ἔπη Ναυπάρκτια were a further development.

² It is worthy of note that Archilochus, with similar injustice, reviles

then greater than they now are, for in our time Bœotia is one of the loveliest and most fertile parts of Greece. The inhabitants came to be ridiculed in the days of Attic greatness for heavy eating, and for their dulness and stupidity—consequences attributed to their moist and foggy climate. Such Attic jibes have been repeated with too much seriousness. The ancient worship of the Muses throughout Bœotia, the splendour of the art and culture of the old Minyans of Orchomenus, the great burst of lyric poetry in the days of the Persian wars, the broad culture of Epaminondas, and through him of Philip, and lastly, the martinmas summer¹ of Greek literature in Plutarch—all these facts, apart from the poetry now before us, show that Bœotia, as we might expect from its rich and well-watered soil, was not only an early home of wealth and civilisation, but sustained its intellectual reputation all through Greek history.

Assuming the *Works and Days* to be the product of the genuine Hesiod, we look in vain for any certain clue to the exact period of the poet's life. The only direct allusion is to his having journeyed to Chalcis in Eubœa for a poetical contest at the funeral games given for Amphidamas, at which he claims to have carried off the prize.² But the only clue to the date of Amphidamas is that he was an active leader in the

the climate and soil of Thasos (fr. 21, ed. Bergk), for Plutarch says :—
καθάπερ Ἀρχίλοχος τῆς Θάσου τὰ καρποφόρα καὶ οἰνόπεδα παρορῶν διὰ τὸ
τραχὺ καὶ ἀνώμαλον διέβαλε τὴν νῆσον, εἰπὼν·

Ἦδε δ' ὥστ' ὄνου ῥάχιν
ἔστηκεν ὕλης ἀγρίης ἐπιστεφής·
οὐ γάρ τι καλὸς χώρος οὐδ' ἐφίμερος
οὐδ' ἐρατός, οἷος ἀμφὶ Σίριος ῥόας.

Plutarch might have said the very same thing of Hesiod, unless, indeed, we hold that the plain of Thebes was covered with forest in old times, as is described in the Homeric Hymn to the Pythian Apollo.

¹ Cf. Archbp. Trench's *Plutarch and his Age*, p. 11, from whom I gladly borrow the expression. Thus also Mr. Symonds aptly calls the *Hero and Leander* of Musæus the fair November day of Greek poetry.

² This contest is apparently transferred to Delos, and described as consisting in singing hymns to Apollo, in frag. 227. We shall return to this point when speaking of the Hymns.

tedious war against the Eretrians about the Lelantine plain.¹ This passage about the poetical tournament at Chalcis is accordingly declared spurious by most critics, and referred to some later Hesiodic bard, who was confused with his great predecessor, just as the blind old poet of Chios (in the Hymn to the Delian Apollo) was commonly confused with Homer. Setting aside, therefore, this hint, they are thrown back upon vaguer inferences.

The poet describes no monarchy, but an aristocratical government, as ruling over his native place. This Ascra was probably under the sway of Thespiæ, which maintained its aristocratical government up to late days, so as to be even in Aristotle's time a remarkable example for citation. It is said that royalty was abolished at Thebes about the middle of the eighth century B.C.; but it is doubtful whether Thebes then controlled a large district. The fact that Hesiod's father² came back from the Æolian settlements in Asia Minor—and on account of poverty—suggests that the colonies had been some time sent out; yet not so long that discontented colonists had forgotten the way home, or their sense of unity with the motherland. But the poem is so full of evident interpolations, that many critics reject even this personal statement about the poet's parentage, and think that a later bard inserted it, in order to inform the readers of the poem about the supposed author's life.

§ 76. From a conservative point of view, the following seems to me the most reasonable theory as to the composition and date of the *Works and Days*.

It is an admitted fact, that about the beginning of the seventh century, B.C., the heroic epics of the Greeks were being supplanted by the poetry of real life—iambic satire, elegiac confessions, gnomic wisdom, and proverbial philo-

¹ Cf. Götting's Pref., p. xxiii, who quotes Plutarch's *Convivium* (c. 10), with additional details. But the genuineness and authority of this tract is denied by F. Nietzsche (*Rhein. Mus.* vol. xxvi.) in his critical examination of the legends of Hesiod's life.

² That his name was Dius seems more than doubtful. Cf. H. Flach in *Hermes* for 1874, p. 358.

sophy. The Greeks grew tired of all the praise of courts and ladies and bygone wars, and turned to a sober—nay even exaggerated—realism, by way of reaction from the worship of Homeric rhapsody. The father and forerunner of all this school is clearly Hesiod, to whom the critics have found strong family likenesses in Archilochus, Simonides of Amorgos, and Hipponax, and stronger evidences of imitation in Alcæus and Theognis. The *Odyssey*, on the other side, both in the society which it describes—the lawless rule of an aristocratic oligarchy; in its catalogue of fair women, the prototype, or antitype, of the Hesiodic *Eoiai*; still more, in the sober tone of its diction, and in its enumerations of names, the *Ἡσιόδειος χαρακτήρ κατ' ὄραμα* of the Alexandrian critics—seems the foretaste, or perhaps the heroic expression, of this changing temper in the public mind. The decisive turning point, to my mind a marked epoch in the history of Greek literature, is the great poetical contest at the funeral games of Amphidamas of Chalcis, when the Hesiodic poetry defeated its Homeric rival. This fact seemed so extraordinary to later critics, that, when they wrote the life of Hesiod, and the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, they sought to invent reasons—and very absurd ones they were—for such a result, and the judges (whose names were remembered) were held up to ridicule.¹

Yet a more philosophical review of the development of Greek poetry shows such a result to be natural and necessary. The Greek public was presented with so many weak and watery epics, with so many faint imitations of the great originals, that even these lost their charm, and were a weariness to them. Then it was that a truly original poet again turned his attention to the only real source of life in any literature—the songs and shrewd sayings of the people. He found old gnomes and advices about practical life, rules of agriculture and of morals fused like the Roman lady's distaff and her chastity.² He recast them in an artistic form, retaining suffi-

¹ Πανέλδου ψῆφος was a proverb for a foolish judgment, Paneides, the brother of Amphidamas, being named as the judge on the occasion.

² This we find in many Roman epitaphs, e.g. those quoted by Mommsen, *Rom. Hist.* vol. I. p. 61, *note* (Eng. Trans.).

cient flavour of their rudeness to preserve their charm for audiences weary of heroic refinement. Thus arose the famous *Works and Days*, the homely rival of Homeric song, the parent of Greek gnomic poetry, the great hand-book of moral teaching among Greek educators. The man who gathered and systematised this old folk lore and folk wisdom—who combined Ionic treatment with a Boeotian subject—who tamed the rude dialect of the farmers on Helicon into an almost epic style—who carried back Ionic memories to his rugged home—who won the tripod at the national contest of Chalcis—who then settled near Naupactus, and died there—this was the real Hesiod. He was not removed by centuries from the poetry which directly followed his lead. He was rather the first of a close and continuous series of poets who took up his realism, though they freed it from its ‘Helot’ flavour, left out his husbandry and his addresses to rustics, and gave his ethics an aristocratic tone.

Even as to the Hesiod whom we possess, I cannot believe that he was the poet of the lower classes, and that his great originality was to address the people. No doubt many of the old proverbs and agricultural advices he gathered were current among the people; but it is to be remarked that the poet distinctly addresses princes also, and gives them a moral lecture (vv. 248, sq.); he looks upon their justice and good conduct as essential to the people, not only because they are its judges, but because their sins are visited by Zeus upon the whole people. This view is to be found in the *Iliad*. Neither does Hesiod speak more harshly of these princes than does the poet of the *Odyssey* in his picture of the suitors. No princes are attacked or lightly spoken of except for their injustice. All this is consistent with an age when an increasing population made agriculture more important, and when the better members among the ruling aristocrats wished to encourage justice and diligence, not only in their subjects, but in their thoughtless or dissipated equals. The high and noble view of the unity and justice of the Supreme Governor of the world—to the complete exclusion of lesser deities—is the most striking feature of the poem, and its

most curious contrast to the *Theogony*. The shepherd class, by the way, is there treated with contempt.

§ 77. The poet of the *Works* seems to me to have lived about the middle of the seventh century, B.C. Here are my reasons:—

The return of his father from Kyme—from a rich and fertile sea-coast to a poor and barren upland farm—can only be accounted for by some grave misfortune or decay in the prosperity of the Asiatic colonies. This is most easily to be found in the rise of the Lydian power under Gyges, after the opening of the seventh century. According to Strabo and Nicolaus Damasc.,¹ this king possessed the whole Troad as far as Abydos, and therefore must have possessed the intermediate territory, which included the inland country round Kyme. The father of the poet seems to have taken at first to sea traffic, but with little satisfaction; and thus, as his agricultural prospects were spoiled by the Lydian conquest, he would ultimately return to Bœotia, from which we may conceive his forefathers to have originally set out.

This chronological argument is evidently strengthened by the further allusion to the games at Chalcis—probably near the conclusion of the Lelantine war. Chalcis and Eretria, which contended for the possession of the disputed plain, were then by their commerce two of the leading cities of Greece Proper. They were founding colonies all over the northern Ægean and the Hellespont. Their war became so important, that all mercantile Greece, especially Samos and Miletus,² joined in the fray. These facts have led historians to see in this war a great commercial conflict; and therefore to place it in the days of the great Hellenic colonisation—about the beginning of the seventh century.³ Hence we must bring down the death of Amphidamas, the ‘king’ of Chalcis, to a period after the Lydian pressure had been for

¹ Quoted by Grote, iii. p. 303 (orig. ed.). Gyges reigned about 680 B.C.

² Herodotus says (bk. v. 99) that the Eretrians were repaying (in 500 B.C.) a debt to the Milesians for helping them previously. It seems absurd to imagine this obligation incurred more than 200 years before.

³ I now see that Fick (*Hom. Olys.* 1883, p. 285) on quite distinct grounds brings down the Lelantine war to Ol. 29.

some time felt.¹ But there is no difficulty in doing so, and E. Curtius' date for the Lelantine war (704 B.C.) is only, I should think, a tentative one, and based on the received dates for the principal colonies, which are all, I suspect, at least a generation too early. But to prove this would lead us too far from our literary history.²

It remains to notice what can be said against this theory, which brings down the date of Hesiod so low, and what evidence there is of his greater antiquity. I pass by the argument of Bergk, who says that Hesiod must have preceded the 1st Olympiad in date, because Eumelus of Corinth, who is said to have been active about Ol. 10, would else be the leader of this school of poetry, whereas he clearly follows Hesiod. This argument contains nothing but ungrounded assumptions. We know nothing of Eumelus, except that all the works attributed to him (save one *prosodion*) were thought spurious by Pausanias.³ His date is unknown; his very personality hazy and doubtful.

§ 78. There is indeed a general belief in the primitiveness of Hesiod, and a desire to place him far anterior to the historical poets of the seventh century; but this also rests on no basis of any value, except the statement of Herodotus, whose real intention was not to raise, but to lower, the date of Homer and Hesiod. They lived, says he, four hundred years before my time, and *not more*. But unfortunately he made them contemporary, and this takes greatly from his authority about Hesiod: for it has been made quite plain by modern criticism that Hesiod presupposes Homer, and is therefore posterior. Of this there is

¹ I think the allusion in Theognis (v. 891) to the ravaging of the Lelantine plain must refer to the Lelantine war as contemporary, and must be an older fragment transferred to the conglomerate which now passes under his name. Indeed, the date of Theognis is not very certain; but most critics place him about 560 B.C. The lines make the war contemporary with the Cypselids, and therefore not concluded before 657 B.C.

² See the evidence for the Lelantine war brought together and discussed in the Appendix to my article on Hesiod in *Hermathena*, No. IV. p. 325.

³ Pausanias (iv. 33, 3) quotes two lines of it (Bergk, p. 811), which are in hexameters, therefore not strictly lyric. In ii. 1, 1, he is even doubtful that the man ever existed. Cf. Flach, *Gr. Lyrik*, i. p. 94.

one clear proof. I put no stress on the shortening of syllables, or other linguistic evidences, as the dialect of Hesiod is not the same as that of the Ionic School, and therefore what seem later modifications may be original differences. But in the description of the Four Ages of Man—the Gold, the Silver, the Bronze, and the Iron—the gradual decadence is broken in upon (after the Bronze) by a fifth race, apparently better than two of its predecessors—that of the heroes who fought and died at the wars of Thebes¹ and Troy. It is evident that no historical place could be found for them, nor were they admitted in the legend which compared the succeeding races of men to the metals. But so powerful was the effect of the Heroic epics, that the shrewd poet of the *Works* thought it necessary to find a niche for this race in his Temple of Fame; and so the legend was distorted to admit them as a fifth race, created out of due time by the Father of gods and of men.² This fact in itself would prove that Homer was considerably anterior to Hesiod, if it were not already perfectly plain to anyone who has studied the logical development of Greek literature. If any critic urges the primitive complexion of many of the saws of Hesiod in defence of his antiquity, I will remind him that my theory postulates this very thing—the adoption, by the historical Hesiod of the seventh century, of all the fine old sayings which floated among the people. I will even concede that there was an earlier collection³: but it seems to me impossible

¹ This seems to imply that the epics based on the Theban cycle of myths were already composed, and widely celebrated—a condition of things pointing to a date after 700 B.C. But the passage *may* be interpolated.

² It is to be noted that the old legends of both Iranians and Indians contain accounts of *five* races of anterior men, and it is not difficult to find a similar division underlying the Semitic history in Genesis. It is, therefore, probable enough that the oldest Greek legends told of *five* races, and that the number was no novelty invented by the poet. But admitting this, the distortion of the legend to suit the glories of the epic heroes of Troy and Thebes is the more remarkable, and an even clearer proof of the reputation of Homer and his school. In all the other legends of five races the decline of excellence seems to be gradual.

³ The enigmatical epitaph ascribed (on Aristotle's authority) to Pindar,

χαῖρε δὲς ἡβήσας καὶ δὲς τάφῳ ἀντιβολήσας
 'Ἡσίοδ', ἀνθρώποις μέτρον ἔχων σοφίης,

to detect it and separate it from the later materials. It is also clearly to be admitted that when the poems came to be used as handbooks of education, many wise and useful proverbs were foisted in, some from later, some from earlier, authors. There is evidence of distinctly inconsistent proverbs being thus brought together, as we find it perpetually the case in the very similar poet, Theognis. The very best lines of this kind being probably those chosen for the purpose, it is surely a perfectly idle proceeding to endeavour to restore the original poem by picking out the good lines, and rejecting what appears to be inferior or weak. The taste of the German critics who have attempted this is not beyond cavil, and they, of course, differ widely from one another in their æsthetic judgments; but, without disputing these, we may hold fairly that many a line may be interpolated, *because* it is good and striking, and that many a line has held its place, in spite of its weakness, because it was acknowledged by tradition as genuine. Nothing can be more absurd than to argue that, because a poet is a great poet, all that he composes must be great, or even consistent with itself. If, as I believe, the original Hesiod compiled from older materials, perhaps not very easily fused; and if most of the interpolations which the critics allege are by them admitted to be so ancient, that the poems were not much different in Plato's day from their present form, it is surely idle to attempt the separation of these various strata. The proœms of both *Works* and *Theogony* may be rejected on fair evidence, and I think there has been patching clearly detected in the long proœm of the latter; but beyond this we can reject with certainty only a very few passages. We may suspect a great many, but have no sufficient evidence to condemn them.

§ 79. Before proceeding to an analysis of the extant works of Hesiod, a word should be said about the legends of his death,

is only explicable, according to Götting (pref. ad Hes. p. 13), by assuming two Hesiods, of whom two tombs were shown. The Orchomenians admitted this, but said that the bones had been transferred from Naupactus (or from Ascra), owing to an oracle. But as Aristotle is speaking only of a second tomb, I suspect ἡβήσας, in spite of the fitness in form, to be a spurious word, concealing some quite different sense.

preserved at length in the γένος Ἰσιούου of Tzetzes, and the ἀγών. After his alleged victory at Chalcis he went to Delphi, where the oracle told him to avoid the fair grove of Nemea, where the goal of death was destined for him.¹ Accordingly, avoiding the Nemea in Peloponnesus, he went to live at CEnoe in Locris, near Naupactus, with Amphidamas and Ganymctor, sons of Phegeus. The coincidence of name with the king of Chalcis at the games is curious. These men, accusing him of having seduced their sister Clymene, murdered him, and threw him into the sea; but the body came to land on the shore between Locris and Eubœa (apparently a confusion between the two separate countries called Locris), and was buried at the sacred grove of Nemea in CEnoe. The people of Orchomenus afterwards removed the body, by advice of an oracle, and buried it in the middle of their *agora*. The epitaph on this tomb has been quoted above.² I should not mention these apparently late fables, but that they were (partly at least) known and alluded to by Thucydides.³

§ 80. The Ἔργα of Hesiod, as it seems to have been once called, without the addition of ἡμέραι, comprises ethics and husbandry in about equal portions, including husbandry under what the Greeks called *Œconomics*; it directs the choice of a wife, the management of the house, and the observation of

¹ Ὀλβιος οὗτος ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐμὸν δόμον ἀμφιπολεύει
Ἑσίοδος, Μοῦσῃσι τετιμένος ἀθανάτησι·
τοῦ δὲ τοι κλέος ἔσται δσσην ἐπικίδναται Ἥως.
ἀλλὰ Διὸς πεφύλαξο Νεμέϊου κάλλιμον ἄλσος·
κεῖθι δέ τοι θανάτοιο τέλος πεπρωμένον ἔστί.

² The age and character of these legends has been carefully discussed by F. Nietzsche in his second article on the ἀγών (*Rhein. Mus.* vol. xxvi.), but without any important positive result, except that of sustaining the ἀγών against the *Convinium* (of Plutarch ?) where they differ.

³ iii. 96. He says of Demosthenes, αὐλισάμενος δὲ τῷ στρατῷ ἐν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Νεμέϊου τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐν ᾧ Ἑσίοδος ὁ ποιητὴς λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν ταύτην ἀποθανεῖν, χρησθέν ἐν Νεμέᾳ τοῦτο παθεῖν. Pausanias also mentions that it was doubted in his day whether Hesiod was falsely accused of the crime or not. Aristotle is referred to as stating in his *πολ. Ὀρχ.* (Müller, *FHG.* ii. p. 144), though perhaps only as a tradition, that Stesichorus was Hesiod's son by Clymene—a legend which certainly brings the date of Hesiod near the very time here suggested.

ordinary morality and superstition. The first ten lines of the exordium were rejected even by the ancients.¹ The address to the *Princes* about their injustice (248-73) is the only part of the poem which could possibly be classed under the head of *politics*, and I think improperly; it is strictly ethical, but not addressed, like the rest, to Perses. The *œconomics*, on the choice of a wife (695-705), are trifling compared to the advices on husbandry (383-617), from which the whole poem took its name. Then follow advices on coast-trading (618-94), and a calendar of lucky and unlucky days (v. 765 to the end). In addition to these principal parts, there are three remarkable episodes—that of Pandora (47-105); that which immediately follows, on the Five (or Four?) Ages of Man; and, lastly, the picturesque description of winter (524-58), which many of the Germans consider a very late and Ionic addition to the grave soberness of the *Works*, breathing a spirit of levity and of display. In these three episodes, Perses is not addressed, nor is he mentioned in the calendar. This latter portion, especially, which consists of brief, disconnected sentences, shows evidence of much interpolation, though it is impossible to expose it. As to the larger episodes opinions vary considerably, each of them being attacked and defended by able scholars. The *proverbial* character of the whole composition is clear from (α) its many short and disconnected sentences, which are in one passage (vv. 300, sq.) only strung together because of the recurrence in them of the root *ἐργ* in various forms.² This attention to sound has been shown to exist all through the Hesiodic poems by Göttling, in the form of (β) alliteration. Many of the successive advices are, furthermore, plainly (γ) inconsistent, as is always the case with proverbial collections of wisdom.

On my theory, this question of genuineness will assume a somewhat different form. The Hesiod of the seventh century—

¹ Yet possibly this invocation of the Muses is very old, and perhaps a specimen of early *hieratic* poetry. The strictly *ethical* parts are vv. 11-46, 202-47, 274-382, 708-64.

² The same peculiarity is to be observed, however, without any such cause, in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite (6 16).

bringing together older materials, loosely and without strict logical nexus—would not be very nice in selecting fragments of precisely the same age and character; he would naturally adorn the dry and sour apophthegms of the Bœotian farmers with episodes of semi-ethical, semi-mythological import. The description of winter is most likely his own, and a most natural description for any man who remembered, or had heard of, the splendid climate of Asia Minor, and who suffered from the severity of his adopted home. But the search after special interpolations is rather a matter of caprice, and of ingenuity, than of literary history; and I therefore refer the reader to the special tracts on the subject.¹

§ 81. The general character of the *Works* is that of a shrewd and somewhat mean society, where private interest is the paramount object, and the ultimate test of morals; but where the poor and undefended man sees plainly that religion and justice, however in themselves respectable, are of value as affording his only chance of safety. The attainment of comfort, or of wealth, seems the only object in view—the distrust of kinsmen and friends seems widely spread—the whole of the social scheme seems awry, and in a decaying condition. All the faults of the Greek character, which come out so strongly in after history, are there, and even obtrusive. The picture of the Iron Age (vv. 180, sq.) contains every one of the features so striking in Thucydides' famous picture (iii. 82) of the fourth century Greeks. Nevertheless, the poet strongly asserts the moral government of the world, and his Zeus is an All-wise and All-knowing Ruler, far removed from the foibles and the passions of the Homeric type. While he mentions the usual evils of poverty—mendicancy and nightly thieving—it is remarkable that he never alludes practically to the horrors of war, or the risk of slavery, from either

¹ Viz. :—A. Twesten, *Comm. Crit. de O. et D.* (Kil., 1815).

F. Thiersch, *De Gnom. Carm. Græc.* (*Abh. Bair. Akad.* iii. p. 391).

C. Lehrs, *Questiones Epicæ* (Königsberg, 1837).

T. L. Heyer, *De Hes. O. et D.* (Schwerin, 1848).

J. Hetzel, *De Carm. Hes. Disp.* (Weilburg, 1860).

A. Steitz, *Die Werke, &c., des Hesiodos* (Leipzig, 1869).

this cause or from piracy. It is, indeed, doubtful whether any of the farm-servants mentioned are slaves, and not rather hired labourers, working for the owner of a freehold farm.¹

The poetical merit of the work has generally been underestimated, owing to a tacit comparison with Homer. In the episodes on the Ages of Man, and the description of winter, there is much fine and vigorous painting, and even in the homely parts there are quaint and happy thoughts, expressed in terse and suitable words. I would specially point to the picture (v. 448) of the farmer hearing the annual scream of the crane in the clouds, and feeling a pang at his heart if he has no oxen to begin his ploughing.²

There is no advice upon wheat-growing, and little on vineyards, though the making of wine is assumed as an ordinary thing among the Bœotian farmers (vv. 611-4); nor is there a word about horses, which were kept only by the nobles. The

¹ I have no doubt about the meaning of the disputed lines (600, sq.):

αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν δὴ
πάντα βίον κατάρθῃαι ἐπάρμενον ἐνδοθι οἴκου,
θῆτά τ' ἄοικον ποιῆσθαι, καὶ ἄτεκνον ἔριθον
δίξασθαι κέλομαι· χαλεπὴ δ' ὑπόπορτις ἔριθος.

Most of the critics translate, 'Procure a day-labourer who has no house [and family],' and as they cannot see why such a servant should be sought when the main work is over, they proceed to strike out the lines, or transfer them elsewhere. This seems to me a good instance of rash scepticism. Hesiod throughout supposes that the farmer has one or more farm-servants (cf. vv. 441, 503, 608). There is always work to be done, as appears from the succeeding verses. The line must, therefore, be taken strictly with the preceding, and rendered, 'When you have brought all your stores into the house, you must turn your man-servant out of it, and look out for a woman servant (who still sleeps within) who has no child to feed.' The repetition of *οἶκος*, which here means *barn*, appears conclusive, and so is the different verb used for the change of residence in one servant, and the procuring of another. This proceeding is, furthermore, recommended *at the beginning of the hot weather*, when sleeping in the open air, or under any natural shelter, is in the climate of Greece no hardship, and not unusual.

² The terms *φερέοικος*, *ήμερόκοιτος*, *πέντοζος*, *ἀνόστεος*, are noted by the commentators, with a few similar formations in Æschylus, as evidences of what they consider an oracular or religious style.

absence of all advice on manuring struck even the Romans,¹ and can hardly be explained by the causes which permit the same omission in the present farming of Bœotia, where the population is so sparse that the land is not occupied, and the husbandman can shift his crop yearly to a piece of ground which has lain fallow the previous season. Such a state of things could hardly have escaped mention through so many details as we find in the *Works*.

§ 82. The *Theogony*, also called the *Genealogy* of Hesiod, and really an abstract of cosmogony, was acknowledged by all antiquity, including Heracleitus and Plato, as the work of Hesiod, until it was called in question by Pausanias,² who states that the Bœotians about Helicon admitted the genuineness of the *Works* only, excluding the preface. He himself, in various places, adopts this opinion as his own, but his reasons, or those of his authorities, are nowhere given. It seems very remarkable (as Götting notes), that in the list of Greek rivers no mention is made of any Bœotian rivers, even of the Cephissus, which is an important stream, and which was mentioned repeatedly in other poems attributed to Hesiod. Thus the special legends of Bœotia would seem strangely neglected by its national poet.

A careful comparison of the two poems will, however, incline us, if we abandon the preface of the *Theogony*, along with that of the *Works*, to pronounce both poems the work of the same author. The subjects are so diverse that constant similarities are hardly to be expected. Nevertheless, Steitz has carefully collected³ so many natural and undesigned likenesses in expression, as almost to persuade himself, in spite of his very sceptical turn of mind. There are, in addition, whole passages of still stronger resemblance. The story of Prometheus and Pandora is told in both poems, but with such variations that it is not possible to determine which is the original, so that we must regard them as independent copies of an older account. There is added in the *Theogony*

¹ In Xenophon's *Œconomics* this essential point is duly discussed.

² ix. 31, 4. He says they had an ancient MS. on lead.

³ *Op. cit.* pp. 37, sq.

a satirical picture of the female sex, which is exactly in the tone and spirit of the *Works*. Both poems further agree in their piecemeal character, and seem to be the production of the same sort of poet—a man of considerable taste for collecting what was old and picturesque, but without any genius for composing from his materials a large and uniform plan.

These general features, when corroborated by the tradition of the Greeks so far back as Heracleitus, seem to me stronger than the objections brought by modern critics from contrasts rather in subject than in style.

There seems, in fact, an argument in favour of unity of authorship from the very contrast of subject. The *Works*, a purely ethical and practical poem, intentionally avoids theology, and treats of the Deity in the vaguest and broadest sense, as a single consistent power, ruling the world with justice. The loves and foibles of the gods, as portrayed in Homer and the Hymns, are evidently distasteful to the poet, and opposed to his notions of pure and practical ethics. In his second poem, on the contrary, he goes at length and in detail into the wars, alliances, and other relations of the gods, but distinctly in the sense of a *cosmogony*, not as the prototype of a human society. The violences which Homer attributed to the gods, as beings of like passions with men, are felt vaguely but strongly by the poet of the *Theogony* to be great convulsions of physical nature—such as the early eruption of *Ætna*, which he pictures under the form of the revolt of Typhœus against Zeus (vv. 820, sq.). We can conceive him then composing the *Theogony* as a sort of supplement to the *Works*; but a supplement already showing the changing attitude of Greek religion, by which it was ultimately dissociated from ethics, and gradually reduced to a mere collection of dogmas and of ritual.

§ 83. The poem begins with 115 lines of invocations to the Muses, which show clear traces of being a *cento* from various older Proœmia, but which contain many passages of considerable beauty.¹ The personal passage (vv. 22–35) has been suspected by the critics, but assuredly represents a very old

¹ On this cf. Deiters, *de Hes. Th. Proœm.*, Bonn, 1863; G. Ellger, *de Hes. Th. Proœm.*, Berlin, 1871, and *Zusätze*, 1883; F. Ehling, *de Hes. Th. Proœm.*, Clausthal, 1875.

tradition, that he was a shepherd on the slopes of Helicon. The Bœotian Muses here distinctly contrast the lying epics of the Ionic bards with the sober truth of the school of Helicon (26-7). There is a very interesting panegyric on Calliope (79-93), in which the eloquence which she bestows on princes is specially brought out as a great power in politics and lawsuits. If there were any allusion to the Muses as *three* (not as nine), I should be more ready to agree with the German critics who regard these fragments of Hymns as very old Bœotian poetry.

After this introduction the poet approaches the genealogies of the gods, from primeval chaos downward till we come to demigods and heroes. The subject is very dry, and the crowds of names make the poem spiritless and dull as a whole, but there are frequent passages of strange power and beauty scattered everywhere through it. The famous passage describing the Styx shows the poet to have known and appreciated the wild scenery of the river Styx in Arcadia.¹ The description of Sleep and Death which immediately precedes is likewise of great beauty. The conflict of the gods and Titans (655, sq.) has a splendid crash and thunder about it, and is far superior in conception, though inferior in execution, to the battle of the gods in the *Iliad*. The same may be said of the struggle between Zeus and Typhœus. At the end of the legend of Pandora a satirical description of the female sex is foisted in, which differs widely in character from the subject of the poem, and is closely allied to the extant fragments of Simonides of Amorgos, and his school. This passage, if genuine, would show how the poet ill concealed a shrewd and bitter temper, in performing what may have been an ungrateful task, and how the age of iambic satire, and of reflective elegy, had already commenced.² Some parts of the conclusion have been tampered with, especially where Latinus and the Tyrrhenians are mentioned, for though Strabo holds that Hesiod knew Sicily, which supports the theory that he lived after the settlement of that island by the Greeks about 700 B.C., it is

¹ vv. 775, sq. This M. É. Burnouf, a most competent observer, testifies (*Lit. grecque*, i. p. 131).

² vv. 590, sq. There are foretastes of this in the *Works*, vv. 701, sq.

absurd to foist upon him any statement about the descent of Latinus from Ithacan parentage.

§ 84. Very little need here be said of the remaining poem of 480 lines, attributed to Hesiod, the so-called *Shield of Heracles*. It begins with an account of the birth of Heracles and Iphitus, then passes to the conflict of Heracles and Iphitus with Ares, and an elaborate description of the shield, from which the poem takes its name. It will be observed that the hero Heracles is not yet described as armed with a mere club and lion's skin, but wears the same panoply as his fellows. The poem was probably intended for recitation at a contest, and seems to be one of the latest of the productions of the epic age. Its genuineness was doubted by the Alexandrian critics, especially Aristophanes, and by Longinus, and they noted that the first fifty-six lines, which begin abruptly with $\eta \alpha\iota\eta$, were to be found in the fourth book of the *Eoia*, or Catalogue of famous women (attributed to Hesiod), where they would naturally appear in the history of Alcmena. But the third preface or $\epsilon\upsilon\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, after stating these facts, adds that Megacles (probably Megacleides), the Athenian, while censuring the merit of the poem, knew it to be genuine. It says that Apollonius Rhodius supported it on internal evidence, as of the same authorship with the *Catalogue*, and lastly that Stesichorus ascribes it to Hesiod. This last authority would be decisive, did we not suspect the writer of the preface of haste or inaccuracy.¹

It has been clearly shown by O. Müller, that while the shield of Achilles in Il. Σ is a mere fancy picture, the shield of Heracles is described from actual observations of plastic productions, and even of favourite subjects which are still extant on vases. While this must lower the date of the poem, it in-

¹ Götting, who divides the poem into three distinct parts—the oldest, taken from the *Catalogue of Women*, vv. 1–56; the second, also old, 57–140 and 317–480; and, lastly, the far later description of the Shield, 141–317—thinks that Stesichorus may have quoted (in his *Cycnus*) from the second part as a work of Hesiod's, and that some of it may really be such. This would not establish the present poem to be genuine, but would admit in it old fragments of the real Hesiod—a most reasonable hypothesis.

creases our sense of the inferiority of the imitator, who could not, with Homer and with actual plastic reliefs before him, imagine a more harmonious piece of work. Almost all the perfections of the grouping in the Iliad are lost, and the terrible and weird are substituted for the exciting and picturesque in Homer. Had we lost the Iliad, we should doubtless admire many of its features in the copy, but fortunately we are not reduced to this extremity. One passage about the tettix, though not very apposite, has great merit.¹

It should be added, as regards its ascription to Hesiod, that it resembles both the *Works* and *Theogony* in a great many expressions and phrases, which are collected by Steitz in the work above cited. It seems therefore, that with the hint concerning Stesichorus before us, we must concede to such conservative critics as choose to assert its authenticity, that their case is not hopeless.

There is a recent reprint of the poem by Fick (*Bezenberger's Beiträge*, xvi. 1) from his peculiar point of view.

§ 85. Of the fragments Gaisford and Dindorf collected a great many, and by the labours of Marckscheffel, Götting, Lehmann, and Hermann, the number has been raised to above 200, if we include mere allusions in scholia and commentators. As literature, they have to us no value, and will never be read, as the fragments of the tragic poets may be, for their own sake. Their general character is quite Hesiodic, that is to say, they treat of lists of gods and heroes in a partly genealogical, partly epical, way. They contain a perfect mine of mythological lore, and give the legends and stories of peoples far beyond the range of the ordinary Hellenic world, so that their composition, generally speaking, cannot fall before the epoch of extended Greek colonisation. Though it is false that Homer and Hesiod made the religion of the Greeks, in the sense of establishing gods and cults, or in altering any old local worships, it seems

¹ vv. 393-9: ἦμος δὲ χλοερῶ κυανόπτερος ἡχέτα τέττιξ
ὄζω ἐφεζόμενος, θέρος ἀνθρώποισιν αἰεῖδειν
ἄρχεται, ᾧ τε πόσις καὶ βρῆσις θῆλος ἐέρση,
καὶ τε πανημέριός τε καὶ ἡφός χέει αὖδην
ἴδει ἐν αἰνοτάτῳ, ὅποτε χροά Σεῖριος ἕξει.

that Hesiod especially did give to the later *literary* Greeks a *Summa Theologiæ*, to which they referred for the origin and relationships of gods and heroes.

This is especially true of (1) the *Catalogue*, in three books, to which was joined the *Great Eoiai* (ἡ οἴη), or *Catalogue of Women*, in two more books, generally quoted as an independent work.¹ The *Catalogue* was a sort of Greek *Peerage*, and gave the family trees and relationships of the principal Greek heroes, so showing the parentage of the Æolic and Doric nobility. We have a fair idea of the fourth book from the fragment preserved at the opening of the *Shield of Heracles*. The date of the *Eoiai* cannot be determined more accurately than by the allusions quoted from it (α) to the nymph Cyrene, probably, therefore, after the founding of that colony (Ol. 39); that of the *Catalogue* by allusions (β) to the Sicilian Ortygia, and (γ) to the fable of Io, which Kirchhoff thinks to have come into vogue about Ol. 30. But all these inferences are very uncertain. (2) The *Αἰγίμιος* attributed by most people to Hesiod, but by some to Cercops the Milesian, was a poem on the war of Ægimius, King of the Dorians, with Heracles as his ally, against the Lapithæ. It seems to have been mainly intended to bring the Doric conquerors of the Peloponnesus into relation with Heracles, through their chiefs, who boasted of their descent from him. (3) The *Κήνκος γάμος* was also a poem introducing Heracles as a leading character, and celebrating his exploits.² (4) The *Μελαμποδία* was about Melampus, Teiresias, Calchas, and other famous prophet-priests, and may have contained some account of the history of prophecy.

§ 86. It is evidently owing to this poem that its supposed author, Hesiod, was considered the forerunner of the Orphic mystical school. Of his successors in this direction we have, besides Orpheus, Eumolpus, Musæus, and Epimenides, but to us these are mere names. In the genealogical direction, we have the Laconian Kinæthon, Asius, Chersias, Eumelus (Κορινθιακά), the anonymous authors of the *Ναυπάκτια ἔπη*, 'Αργολικά, and

¹ In Locris, the probable home of this poem, the importance of female ancestry (the primitive *Mutterrecht*) long survived. Cf. Bergk, *LG.* i. p. 1002.

² Plutarch (*Sympos.* viii. 8, § 4) speaks of it as foisted upon Hesiod by an anonymous author.

the Φορωνίς, and others who were not apparently in any contact with the Ionic epic, but Hesiodic in character.

The Ἀριμύσπεια by Aristeas of Proconnesus was, on the contrary, a collection of fantastic fables about nations and countries beyond the knowledge, but within the rumour and the imagination, of the early Ionic adventurers into strange seas and coasts. There was, indeed, a supposed *journey round the world*, or γῆς περίοδος, ascribed to Hesiod, but probably of later origin.¹ A few lines are also preserved of the Χείρωνος ὑποθήκαι, a set of moral instructions supposed to be given by Cheiron to Achilles, and which Quintilian says were thought Hesiod's till pronounced spurious by Aristophanes of Byzantium.²

§ 87. It remains to give a short sketch of the external history of the Hesiodic poems through antiquity, and down to our own day. It is very hard to say whether the strong family likeness in Archilochus to Hesiod arises from a similarity in tone and style, or from direct contact. The extant fragments are not sufficient to prove the latter, which would hardly place Hesiod at an earlier date than I am disposed to accord him. But if he were an earlier contemporary, and living in a parallel state of things, general similarities might be expected. Archilochus told beast fables like that in Hesiod. He unjustly reviles the climate of Thasos and its barrenness, in contrast to the valley of the Siris, just as Hesiod censures the rich Bœotia, as compared with Kyme. Yet there is no proof of borrowing. The same may be said as regards Semonides of Amorgos, whom the critics place, doubtfully, in the middle of the seventh century B.C., and contemporary with Archilochus. Here, again, there are strong family likenesses to the *Works*;

¹ It is cited by Strabo, vii. p. 302, and there is also an *astronomy*, cited by Plutarch and Pliny.

² Of Hesiodic fragments there are several collections, of which those by Düntzer (Köln, 1840-41), by Marckscheffel (Lips. 1840, which also contains the fragments of the other authors above alluded to), by Götting (appendix to his *Hesiod*, ed. 2, Gotha, 1843), and by F. S. Lehrs (in the Didot *Corpus Epicorum*, Paris, 1862), are all to be recommended, the last being, of course, the fullest and best. The old lists of the works ascribed to Hesiod are found in Pausanias, ix. 31, 5, and in Suidas, art. Ἡσίοδος; they contain a few additional titles to those I have mentioned. There are since collections by Kinkel and Düntzer.

but the only passage (in the *Theogony*) which could be supposed the direct model of Semonides' satire on women is decidedly an interpolation in Hesiod, and its use of the bee (in an opposed sense to that of Semonides) for the working men, with drones for the women, seems to me plainly a satiric correction of Semonides, and composed after his famous poem.

We know nothing whatever of Kerkops, who is mentioned as Hesiod's earliest follower and rival, nor is there any real evidence of Terpander having been such. In the extant lyric and elegiac fragments no certain trace appears till Alcæus, whose frag. 39 is a most distinct copy of Hesiod. So likewise the resemblances in Theognis are far more than general, and it seems undeniable that in the middle of the sixth century the poems of Hesiod—at least the *Works*—were well known and circulated.

Acusilaus is mentioned by Plato, Josephus, and a schol. on Apollonius Rhodius, as a commentator or prose paraphrast of the *Theogony*. Bernhardt supposes him to have been a Peloponnesian theologian, who collected genealogies and cosmogonies, and arranged them after the manner of Hesiod, though in prose. But we are left quite in the dark by our authorities concerning him.

Most critics refer to the same epoch an old poem on the *Contest and the Origin of Homer and Hesiod*, which is largely quoted in the extant tract of that title.¹ This poem seems, at any rate, to have originated in those days when the gnomic and sententious Bœotian school had obtained a greater popularity than its Ionic rival. The scene is laid at the contest of Chalcis, and the author aims at proving that, although Hesiod was declared victor, Homer was far the greater poet—a needless task. But, as we shall see presently, the very existence of such a poem is denied by the most recent critic, Nietzsche.

Shortly before and after the times of the Persian wars, Xenophanes, and then Heracleitus, attack Hesiod—the first for his immoral teaching, along with Homer, about the doings of the gods (*Theogony* and *Catalogue*); the second for idle learning on the same profitless subject.

¹ Printed at the end of Götting's and Lehrs' editions of Hesiod; and more recently, with great critical care, in the *Acta Soc. Phil.* of Leipzig, vol. i. pp. 1, sq., by F. Nietzsche.

It seems that he was subjected to some critical revision, about this time, by the commission of Peisistratus, for Plutarch (*Theseus*, c. 20) mentions a verse which was then removed. Whether the poems had been hitherto preserved by a school of Hesiodic rhapsodists, is not sufficiently clear. It is certain, however, that they were recited at poetical contests, and in early days without musical accompaniment, for Pausanias¹ criticises a statue of Hesiod with a lyre on his knees as absurd, seeing that he sang with a bay branch in his hand. This was in contrast to the Ionic rhapsodising.² These opposed methods were not strictly adhered to in after times, and were even occasionally reversed.

But in Attic days Hesiod attained a widespread popularity as an author of moral instruction for the use of schoolmasters and parents. The Greeks, indeed, always regarded the *Works* as an ethical treatise, while the Romans laid more stress on its agricultural side. Plato constantly alludes to Hesiod, and quotes him, not very accurately, as an authority in morals and in theology. He is similarly cited by Xenophon. So thoroughly was this recognised that the comic writers brought him on the stage as the ideal of an old-fashioned schoolmaster, full of cut-and-dry moral advices. The philosophers who succeeded Plato, especially the Stoics Zeno and Chrysippus, made him the subject of criticism; and Epicurus is said to have got his first impulse towards philosophy from reading the *Theogony*. The same story is told of Manilius, the Roman poet.

Philologically, the works of Hesiod excited the same sort of interest as those of the Ionic epic poets, but in a lesser degree. We still have scanty traces of the critical notices of Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus; of Apollonius Rhodius, of Crates, and of Didymus; in fact, of almost all those whose

¹ ix. 30, 2: ἐπὶ ῥάβδου δάφνης ᾗδεν.

² Pausanias (x. 7, 3) tells us a story, that Hesiod was excluded from contending at the Pythian games, because he had not been taught to play the lyre along with his singing. But when he adds that Homer also was unsuccessful, because his training in the art could not be perfected owing to his want of sight, he seems to repeat the stories of the time when the richer and more elaborate lyric poetry came to look upon the old epic recitation as bald and poor.

names are found in the Homeric scholia. But Plutarch, as a Bœotian, wrote a special treatise in four books on Hesiod, which the remaining fragments show to have been both critical and explanatory, with discussions of an antiquarian and patriotic character, defending the poet against objectors. His work was the main source of the commentary of Proclus, who again was copied servilely by Tzetzes. The later commentary of Manuel Moschopoulos is still extant, and completely printed in the Venice ed. of 1537.

§ 88. The prose tract, *The Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, is the work of some rhetor who mentions the Emperor Hadrian, but its date is not further fixed. It is very full on the legends and parentage of both Homer and Hesiod. The antiquity and authority of the legends told in this tract are worthy of a moment's discussion. The version in Plutarch's *Convivium* (cap. x.) professes to give Lesches as the authority for the contest, and apparently Lesches the cyclic poet. If this were so, the legend is old and of good authority, and as such is accepted by Götting and other editors of the life of Hesiod. But the stray citation of Lesches in the middle of the Plutarchian narrative has offended modern critics, who have either emended the text, or considered it a marginal gloss indicating that the immediately following lines are to be found in Lesches' poem. Nietzsche goes further, and rejects the whole *Convivium* as spurious and not by Plutarch at all. This being so, there remains no older authority cited in the ἀγών than the rhetor Alkidamas, a well-known pupil of Gorgias, who will be considered hereafter. This man composed a treatise called τῆς φύσεως Μουσεῖον, *On mental culture*, in which he seems to have described the contest of Homer and Hesiod to show that Homer was the forerunner of Gorgias in rapid improvisation and extempore reply. Drawing his conclusions from slight and to me insufficient hints, Nietzsche infers that the opening part of Alkidamas' book contained a much fuller account of the contest of Homer and Hesiod, from which the author of our extant ἀγών abridged his narrative, particularly by cutting down the citations. When Nietzsche further asserts that Alkidamas invented the whole story of the *Contest*, and that to him we must refer all our legends of it, he goes, I think, a great deal

too far. The passage in Hesiod's *Works* about the contest at Chalcis is probably older than Alkidamas, even if interpolated, and I can hardly believe that this alleged contest and rivalry between the two great epic bards was not thought of till the rhetor's time. But it is very likely that he worked up the old story into a smart rhetorical form, and made it popular. So far he may have been the chief source of the *Contest* as we have it.

The *Contest* also cites Eratosthenes the Alexandrian, who wrote a poem called 'Ἡσιόδου ἢ Ἀντερινύς on the story of the poet's death; but whether he differed widely from Alkidamas, and used other legends, we cannot tell. So also Aristotle is said to have mentioned the tomb of Hesiod in his *Polity of the Orchomenians*, but here again we have only a stray citation.¹

The γένος Ἡσιόδου, generally printed as a preface to his works, is probably a mere compilation of Joh. Tzetzes, from Proclus, but is very instructive, like the ἀγών, in indicating to us what materials were still at hand in that epoch.

§ 89. *Bibliographical.* Passing on to the MSS. left us, we find a very great number of copies of the *Works*, covered with scholia, and often with illustrations of the farming implements, but not critically valuable. The oldest² seems to be the Medicean 5, of the eleventh century; then the Medicean 3 (Plut. xxxii. 15), of the twelfth. The rest are all fourteenth and fifteenth century books, generally on paper, full of scholia and notes, and variously put together with the other Hesiodic works, and with Theocritus, Nonnus, the pseudo-Pythagorea, and other moral fragments. Flach has written monographs on the scholia (Leipzig, 1876, on the *Theog.*; Jahn's J. for 1877 on the *Works*). The MS. copies of the *Theogony* and *Shield* are not so frequent, and none, I believe, so old as the twelfth century. The sort of collection generally found in the MSS. is well reproduced in the beautiful Aldine ed. of 1495, which, though the *Works* were brought out a year or two earlier at

¹ All these legends have been classified, with little positive result, by O. Friedel in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher* for 1879, pp. 235, sq.; to which I refer the reader for elaborate details. There is also a paper on Hesiod's Life by G. H. Flach in *Hermes* for 1874, pp. 357, sq., and a discussion by Rohde in *Rhein. Mus.* vol. xxxvi. pp. 380, sq.

² Not to mention some trifling papyrus fragments of Hesiod in the *Rainer Papyri*, vol. i. 3-4.

Milan, is the first which gives the whole, and is the *Ed. princeps* for the rest of Hesiod. It contains a great many other authors, and even stray collections of proverbs. The Juntine eds. of 1515 and 1540 are said to be mere copies of the Aldine. That of Trincavelli in 1537 gives the scholia in full, and has independent merit. Then come the great edition of Stephanus (1566), and a very complete one of D. Heinsius. Of later commentators the first place is due to Gaisford, whose Oxford edition is admirable from its fulness of research about both MSS. and scholia (*Poetæ minores Græci*, 1814-20). Next may be mentioned Götting's (3rd ed. by Flach, 1878, with good Prolegomena and notes). Then the editions of Lehrs, Marckscheffel, Paley, which last has many questionable derivations and speculations about the Digamma.¹ We have also the critical ed. of Koechly and Kinkel, which has been reproduced in the newest Teubner text. The *Theogony* has been separately published by Flach, and previously by Wolf and by Welcker. Most recently we have the critical recension of A. Fick, with his peculiar theories concerning the text in *Bezzenberger's Beiträge*, xii. 1, sq., and in a separate number (1887). There are many special dissertations cited in the article Hesiod in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Brit.*

The imitations in Virgil's *Georgics* are too well known

¹ I have said nothing about the Digamma, because I do not believe its presence or absence can as yet be applied in determining the genuineness or spuriousness of any line in Hesiod. The careful researches of the Germans have shown that it is present or absent in the same word according to the exigencies of the metre; and there seems really evidence for the fact that the Digamma was a letter which could be arbitrarily used or dispensed with in epic poetry. There is the most surprising variation, exactly of the same kind, though without metrical reasons, in the inscriptions of the same towns. According to the researches of Fick, the Ionians had lost it at a very early period; the Æolians, and probably the Delphian or Boeotian dialect, which Hesiod used, still retained it. But by transliterating old Æolic poems into the more fashionable Ionic, there arose inconsistency of use, some old forms resisting the change, while others could be replaced by metrical equivalents. This jumble of dialects, however, soon became fashionable, and was used as an *epic dialect*, quite artificial, and yet presently becoming popular. I do not think that the means at our disposal yet enable us to determine whether a particular passage is an old poem transliterated or a later poem written in the composite dialect.

to require closer description. There are translations into German by Voss, and Uschner, and into French by Gin and Bergier, in addition to the Latin hexameter translations of the Italians, N. Valla, and B. Zamagna, in the fifteenth century, and the early French one of Jacques le Gras in 1586.

As to English translations, I cannot find any mention of more than three. The first is of the *Works* only, the '*Georgics* of Hesiod,' by George Chapman (1618). This, like all Chapman's work, is poetical and spirited, but often very obscure to modern readers, though it constantly cites the original in foot-notes. The book, which was very scarce, has been reprinted, with other of Chapman's translations, by J. R. Smith (London, 1858). Next we have the work of Cooke (1743), who seems unaware of Chapman's translation, and who gives us a pretentious and dull rendering of the *Works* and *Theogony* in heroic verse. The last and best, and the only complete translation, including the *Shield*, is that of Elton (2nd ed. 1815), who knew his predecessors well, and gives us scholarly renderings of the *Works* in heroic rimes, and of the other two poems in blank verse. Parnell's *Pandora, or the Rise of Woman*, is a free imitation of the corresponding pair of passages in Hesiod.

§ 90. There is no use in discussing the several busts and statues of Hesiod, which Pausanias saw and describes in his tour through Greece. It need hardly be stated that these, like the portraits of Homer, were mere works of imagination, and have no historical claims. There are five epigrams or epitaphs upon him extant, two quoted at the end of Tzetzes' Greek preface to his works, and stated to be set over his tomb in the *agora* of Orchomenus—one of them ascribed to Pindar. Three others are in the Anthology, one of which, by Alcæus of Messene, has considerable merit.

§ 91. There is sufficient evidence of the antagonism between the Homeric and Hesiodic rhapsodists in the legend of the contest of the poets, and we may even infer from the alleged victory of the inferior but more didactic poet, that as the audience became more reflective, and as they came to regard the poet as an educator, the more explicit moral purpose, and

the plainer preaching of the Hesiodic school, came to be regarded as superior to the mere stimulating of the sense of honour through the imagination by the heroic poems. But it might have been easily foretold that the controversy would not stop there, and that as philosophy arose, the whole system of the chivalry of Homer and the Theogonic dogmatism of Hesiod would find opponents from a totally different platform. It might perhaps even have been anticipated that these opponents would choose the very form of the Ionic epos to embody their criticisms. The *Golden Verses*¹ ascribed to the school of Pythagoras, which contain the condensed morals of the older epics, even were they genuine, are not so natural an outcome of the clever restless Greek mind as the making of objections and exceptions.

§ 92. These found their earliest spokesman in *Xenophanes* of Colophon, who travelled through the Hellenic world during most of the fifth century, but who seems to have formulated his system in early life, and to have disseminated it in his wanderings as a rhapsode, in opposition to those who were reciting the old epics at every festival throughout Greece. *Xenophanes* was indeed a poet of various accomplishments, and we have admirable fragments of his elegiacs, which will be mentioned in their place (below p. 208), as well as a few iambic lines. But these, though they show the independent and radical spirit of the man, were chiefly social poems, and evidently did not contain his main philosophy. This he published by going about as a rhapsode, and reciting it in the same epic form as the poems of Homer and Hesiod. We have sufficient remnants to show that he systematically attacked the anthropomorphism of Greek religion, the plurality and conflicting interests of the gods, and that he asserted the unity and purity of the Deity. But the allusions of such critics as Aristotle prove that his polemic was not merely theological, and that his negative criticism was associated with metaphysical speculations on the unity, not only of the Deity, but of the world. It was from this point of view that he was the founder of the Eleatic school, as he lived much of his later life in this Italian city, and as his system was taken up and developed by his great pupil *Parmenides*.

¹ Their remains are printed at the end of Götting's *Hesiod*.

§ 93. If we could trust the chronological points in Plato's dialogues, *Parmenides* was sixty-five when Socrates was a 'very young man,' perhaps between fifteen and twenty; but Plato cares for none of these things, and looks only to dramatic and not to historical propriety. It seems more likely that Parmenides came earlier, perhaps about the opening of the fifth century, and he still adhered in philosophy to the old didactic epic, which had been consecrated to serious teaching by Hesiod and his school. But it is evident that while prose composition, both in history and in philosophy, since Hecataeus and Heraclitus showed the way, made rapid progress among the Ionians of Asia Minor, the Greeks of Italy and Sicily adhered to the poetic form, as is the case with Empedocles, who wrote even a generation or two later. Thus the fact that Heraclitus had published his thoughts in prose at Ephesus is no proof that the hexameter poem of Parmenides may not have been later in date, though more primitive in form. We fortunately have the opening of the work preserved by Sextus Empiricus. and there is no doubt that it combined (like the poem of Empedocles copied by Lucretius) remarkable brilliancy of fancy with profundity of thought.¹

¹ This introduction is preserved by Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. Math.* vii. 111) :

Ἴπποι ταί με φέρουσιν, ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ θυμὸς ἰκάνοι,
πέμπον, ἐπεὶ μ' ἐς ὁδὸν βῆσαν πολύφημον ἄγουσαι
Δαίμονος ἢ κατὰ πάντ' αὐτὴ φέρει εἰδὸτα φῶτα·
τῇ φερόμην, τῇ γάρ με πολύφραστοι φέρον Ἴπποι
ἔρμα τιταίνουσαι κοῦραι δ' ὁδὸν ἡγεμόνευον
Ἥλιάδες κοῦραι, προλιποῦσαι δώματα νυκτός,
εἰς φάος, ὡσάμεναι κρατῶν ἅπο χερσὶ καλύπτρας.
Ἄξων δ' ἐν χνοιῇσιν ἴει σύριγγος αὐτὴν
αἰθόμενος, δοιοῖς γὰρ ἐπέλεγτο δινωτοῖσι
κύκλοις ἀμφοτέρωθεν, ὅτε σπερρχοῖατο πέμπειν.
Ἔνθα πύλαι νυκτός τε καὶ ἡματός εἰσι κελεύθων,
καὶ σφας ὑπέρθυρον ἀμφὶς ἔχει καὶ λαῖνος οὐδός,
αὐταὶ δ' αἰθέρι κέκλεινται μεγάλοισι θυρέτροις
τῶν δὲ Δίκη πολυποίνος ἔχει κληῖδας ἀμοιβούς.
τὴν δὲ παρφάμεναι κοῦραι μαλακοῖσι λόγοισι
πεῖσαν ἐπιφραδέως, ὥς σφιν βαλανωτὸν ὀχῆα
ἂπτερέως ὥσειε πυλέων ἅπο· ταὶ δὲ θυρέτρων

Other considerable extracts from Parmenides are quoted by Simplicius, in which we no longer find the theological tone of Xenophanes, but the purely metaphysical treatment of the doctrine known ever since as the Eleatic philosophy. The eternal and incorruptible unity of Being, as opposed to the fleeting unreality of sense, is illustrated with much power and variety. The celebrated dialogue of Plato, in which Parmenides is the chief speaker, as well as many allusions of Aristotle, give us full information concerning his philosophy. But from a literary point of view, it is to be noted that though he wrote this hexameter poem *on Nature*, he was not a poet in the same sense as Xenophanes, who also composed both elegiacs and iambics, and was a professed reciter. He even repeated his views, according to Plato (*Soph.* 237, A), in a prose form—the form exclusively adopted by his immediate followers, Zeno and Melissus. These therefore we must class under the head of early prose writers.

§ 94. It is indeed asserted in Aristotle's *Poetic*, that this sort of epic composition has nothing in common with Homer but the metre, wherefore, he adds, you call the one a poet, and the other rather a physiologist than a poet. This remark specially refers to *Empedocles*, the third and greatest name on the list of our philosophic poets, and is but another example of the reckless judgments which the authority of Aristotle has disse-

χάσμ' ἀχανὲς ποίησαν ἀναπτάμεναι, πολυχάλκους
 ἄξοντας ἐν σύριγγιν ἀμοιβαδὸν εἰλίξασαι
 γόμοις καὶ περὺνησιν ἀρηρότας· ἥ ῥα δι' αὐτῶν
 ἰθὺς ἔχον κοῦραι κατ' ἀμαξιδὸν ἄρμα καὶ ἵππους.
 καὶ με θεὰ πρόφρων ὑπεδέξατο, χεῖρα δὲ χειρὶ
 δεξιτερὴν ἔλεν, ὧδε δ' ἔπος φάτο καὶ με προσηύδα·
 ὦ κοῦρ' ἀθανάτοισι συνάρορος ἠνιόχοισιν,
 ἵππους ταῖ σε φέρουσιν ἰκάνων ἡμέτερον δῶ,
 χαῖρ' ἐπεὶ οὔτι σε μοῖρα κακῇ προῦπεμπε νέεσθαι
 τὴν δ' ὁδὸν (ἥ γὰρ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων ἐκτὸς πάτου ἔστιν),
 ἀλλὰ θέμις τε δίκη τε. Χρεῶ δέ σε πάντα πύθεσθαι
 ἡμὲν ἀληθείας εὐπειθέος ἀτρεκέως ἦτορ,
 ἡδὲ βροτῶν δόξας, ταῖς οὐκ ἐνὶ πίστις ἀληθῆς.
 Ἄλλ' εὐπης καὶ ταῦτα μαθήσεται ὥς τὰ δοκοῦντα
 χρὴ δοκίμως γινῶναι διὰ παντὸς πάντα περῶντα.

minated by means of this corrupt treatise. For had the observation been applied to Parmenides, it might have been possibly defended, though our scanty remains contain passages of lofty imagination and true poetic fire. But applied to Empedocles, the remark is simply ridiculous, and might have been contemptuously rejected, even if there were not preserved to us by Diogenes¹ the opinion of the true Aristotle, which happens in express terms to contradict the criticisms of the *Poetic*. We have furthermore the judgments of the careful Dionysius on his 'austere harmony,' which he compares to that of Æschylus, and the not inconsistent praise of Plutarch for his inspired enthusiasm. Mr. Symonds, in his essay on the poet, goes so far as to call him the Greek Shelley, and gives some striking grounds for this singular judgment.

As a poet, therefore, Empedocles must be ranked very high, and Cicero expressly tells us that his verses were far superior to those of Xenophanes and Parmenides, themselves no mean artists on similar subjects. This is the more remarkable because he came late in the development of didactic poetry, and in the age when prose had already been employed with great success by Heracleitus for the purposes of philosophic exposition. But although Empedocles seems not to have been born till about 490 B.C., and was about contemporary, both in birth and death, with Herodotus, he was born, not in the home of nascent prose, but at Agrigentum in Sicily, where he became one of the forerunners of a literature widely different from that of the Ionic race. For Gorgias is called his pupil, and though he does not appear to have composed any treatise in prose, he was considered by Aristotle the first founder of the art of rhetoric, which Gorgias made the occupation of his life.

Though of noble family—his grandfather Empedocles had won with a four-horsed chariot at the 71st Olympiad, his father Meton had been prominent in expelling the tyrant Thrasydæus—he was firmly devoted to democratic principles, and fought for the demos of his city against the aristocracy.

¹ viii. 3 : ἐν δὲ τῷ περὶ ποιητῶν φησιν ὅτι καὶ Ὅμηρος δ' Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ Δεινὸς περὶ τὴν φράσιν γέγονε, μεταφορικὸς τ' ὢν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς περὶ ποιητικὴν ἐπιτεύγμασι χρώμενος.

But, like Herodotus and other patriots of that period, he found it unpleasant to live at home among hostile and jealous neighbours; he accordingly left Agrigentum, and retired to the Peloponnese, where he seems to have died in obscurity. This we may infer from the many uncontradicted legends which became current through Greece upon the subject. Empedocles is one of the most curious and striking figures in Greek literature, for he combined the characters of soothsayer, magician and mystic with those of an earnest and positive speculator, who first attempted a mechanical explanation of nature. His account of the gradual growth and development of animated organisms even gives him the right to be called the oldest Greek forerunner of Darwin.

These physiological and physical speculations, which fascinated the mind of Lucretius, belong to the province of the historian of philosophy. But the literary form in which they were clothed causes much perplexity. For this poet-philosopher, this positivist-magician, would not clothe his metaphysic in any but allegorical dress. Thus the four elements¹ which he was the first to assert against Parmenides' single Being, and which lived in philosophy till yesterday, are clothed in the garb of the people's gods: and his attraction and repulsion, by which the world of experience was compounded out of the elements, were called Love and Hate (*Φιλότης* and *Νεῖκος*), the former even Aphrodite. Along with these apparent concessions to the popular faith, he held Pythagorean doctrines as to the transmigration of souls, and the consequent crime of destroying animal life, though his politics separate him widely from the Pythagorean school. His metaphysic is an independent syncretism of Eleatic and Heracleitic doctrines, with a predominance of the latter, perhaps on account of the deeper poetry of Heracleitus' prose. But though the man's personality, his splendid dress, his numerous attendants, and his bold claims to supernatural power, made him a great figure in the Sicily of his day, his mystical and theological turn would not bear the light of positive science,

1. τέσσαρα τῶν πάντων ριζώματα πρῶτον ἄκουε·

Zeûs [air] *ἀργῆς Ἥρη* [earth] *τε* *φερέσβιος ἦδ' Ἀἰδωνεύς* [fire]

Νῆσις [water] *θ' ἢ δακρύοις τέγγει κρούνωμα βρῦτειον.*

and he is therefore referred to with less respect by succeeding critics as a philosopher than as a lofty poet. The tragedies and political writings ascribed to him were spurious ; his *φυσικά* and *καθαρμοί*, the formal exposition of his metaphysic and of his theology; are the only works recognised by modern critics. It has been inferred from the fragments that these books were not very consistent, that the various purifications and rites recommended (in the *καθαρμοί*) were little in consonance with the mechanical and positive explanations of his *φυσικά*.

§ 95. They were, moreover, very alien to the dialectic of Gorgias and the succeeding sophists, who cared little for dogmatic theology, and consistently rejected the ritual of the old religion along with its dogmas. The sophists were still more marked in their rejection of epic verse as the vehicle for philosophic teaching, and in the uniform adoption of prose, which was even then introduced in the schools of Asia Minor. So strongly was this felt in the next generation, that there arises a formal opposition between philosophers and poets, the latter of whom were regarded as the mere exponents of the popular creed. Of course this would have been absurdly false in the days of Parmenides and Empedocles; but even the latter was almost behind his age, and from the middle of the fifth century B.C. onwards Greek philosophy consistently adopted prose instead of a poetical form. Anaxagoras was, no doubt, reflected in Euripides, and Epicurus in Menander; but these speculative features in the drama were the mere natural reflex of the deepest thinking of the day upon its most thoughtful and serious poets. The philosophy of Euripides was a mere parergon of his tragedy. It is to this fixed purpose of philosophy to abandon poetry that we must attribute the defection of such imaginative minds as Hippocrates and Plato from the ranks of the Greek poets, among whom the latter (as an epigrammatist) even made his first essay. The history of philosophy since that day confirms the Greeks as to the literary propriety of this decision. Despite the splendid attempt of Lucretius to reproduce in the form of Empedocles the most prosaic and vulgar of systems, his poem had little influence upon his age, and is even spoken of by Cicero with some contempt. The Neoplatonists, however

mystical and Eleatic in tone, never returned to the more ancient and indeed natural garb of their vague Pantheism. The Middle Ages were dominated by the prosaic Aristotle. Nor did any of the great heralding of modern thought, the rich imagery of Bacon, the mystic dawning of Boehme, the god-intoxicated cosmogony of Spinoza, proclaim itself to a world weary of the dry and arid light of prose logic in the form consecrated of old to the union of thought and fancy. In later days, though modern poetry is full, perhaps too full, of metaphysic and of anthropology, we have no greater attempt at writing systematic philosophy in verse than Pope's *Essay on Man*, or Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*. Thus Empedocles is peculiarly interesting as the last thinker in European philosophy who brought out a new system in the form of a poem.

His fragments are preserved in Sextus Empiricus, Plutarch, and Simplicius, and are best collected by Müllach (in Didot's *Fragg. Philosoph.*). There are interesting monographs on him in all the histories of Greek philosophy, especially Zeller's, and in Mr. Symonds' first series on the Greek poets. The legend of his death in the crater of Etna has inspired poets down to our own day, like Mr. Arnold, and still lingers about the traditions of the mountain through changes of race and of language.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE HOMERIC HYMNS AND TRIFLES.

§ 96. THERE is yet another class of epic hexameter poetry extant, besides the proper Ionic epics, and the didactic poems of Hesiod and the philosophers. There are transmitted to us, under the title of *Homeric Hymns*, a collection of five longer and twenty-nine shorter poems in epic dialect and metre, each inscribed to some particular god, and narrating some legend connected with him, but in no sense religious hymns, as were those of Pamphus or the hymns of the choral lyric poets. The Homeric Hymns are essentially secular and not religious; they seem distinctly intended to be recited in competitions of rhapsodes, and in some cases even for direct pay;¹ they are all in form preludes (*προοίμια*) to longer recitations,² apparently of epic poems,³ though the longer five are expanded into substantially independent compositions.

¹ Hymn vi. *sub fin.* :

δὸς δ' ἐν ἀγῶνι
νίκην τῷδε φέρεσθαι, ἐμὴν δ' ἔντυνον αἰοιδήν.

And v. xxx. and xxxi. *sub fin.* :

πρόφρων δ' ἀντ' ᾗδῃς βίοτον θυμήρε' ὕπαξε.

² *οἶμη*, according to Bergk, meant any song, especially an epic poem. *οἶμος* is used with a genitive (*ἐπέων*, &c.) qualifying it. Pausanias calls a hymn of Alcæus to Apollo a *προοίμιον*, probably because it was like in character to these Hymns. The *νόμοι* were really devotional poems, and are as such contrasted by Pausanias with the secular hymns of the collection before us.

³ Hymn xxxi. :

ἐκ σέο δ' ἀρξάμενος κλήσω μερόπων γένος ἀνδρῶν
ἡμιθέων, ὧν ἔργα Θεοὶ θνητοῖσι ξδειξαν.

§ 97. The *Hymn to the Delian Apollo*, apparently the third in order in the archetype of our MSS., is by far the best known and oftenest quoted of the collection. It owes this distinction chiefly to the famous description near its close of the old festival at Delos, whither all the Ionians came, with their wives and children, to witness dancing, singing and boxing, and to wonder at the ventriloquism which the Delian priestesses appear to have studied to great perfection. Then follows a somewhat boastful assertion of excellence on the part of the rhapsodist—the blind man of Chios (probably Kynæthos ; cf. Fick, *Odyss.* pp. 278, sq.). The main body of the hymn narrates the adventures of Latona before the birth of Apollo, her final reception by the personified island Delos, and the long-delayed birth of the god. Artemis is not mentioned, and cannot therefore have been regarded as his twin-sister in the Delian legend. The style of the poem is good and clear, and indicates a date when epic language and metre were perfectly understood.¹

§ 98. Our MSS. combine this hymn (178 lines) and what is now established to be a much older work, the *Hymn to the Pythian Apollo*. The allusions of Thucydides and of Aristides² imply that they quote from the end of the former hymn (v. 172), which is only the case if we separate the Pythian hymn. Furthermore, the scholiast on Pindar³ quotes some lines as Hesiod's, in which he boasts of contending with Homer at Delos in hymns to Apollo. This shows an old belief that a second hymn to Apollo, by Hesiod, existed. The Pythian hymn has quite this character ; it is altogether occupied with Bœotian and Delphian legends, and celebrates the settlement of the god at the rocky Pytho after his colloquy with the fountain-nymph Delphusa, near Haliartus, and his slaying of the Python. Then follows his adventure, in the form of a dolphin, with the Cretan sailors, whom he brought round the Peloponnesus from their course, and established as his priests at the oracle. Besides the Bœotian character of its legends, the genealogical and etymological tone of the poem betrays that it was composed

¹ Riem, *De Hym. Ap. Del.* (Münster, 1872), dates this Hymn about 600 B.C. ; Fick (*Odyss.* p. 285) at 660, and prints a critical text (pp. 286, sq.) ; in *B.B.* xvi. 26, at 504 !! and gives reasons.

² Cf. Bergk, *LG.* i. p. 753.

³ *Nem.* ii. 1.

by some Delphian or Bœotian poet in imitation of the former hymn, which it closely follows in its construction, and oftentimes in diction.

There are many disturbances in the text, and to these may be ascribed apparent blunders in the geography of Bœotia, which the author seems to have known accurately. He is also fully acquainted with the coasts of the Peloponnesus. There are several remarkable and evidently intentional omissions. The site of Thebes is mentioned as being still forest, and therefore supposed to have been occupied after the settlement at Delphi. Delphi, again, is only known by the name of Pytho. Kirrha, the seaport of Krissa, is never mentioned, but the latter is said to be near the harbour. Though describing a curious augury with chariots at Onchestus (vv. 53, sq.), and therefore familiar with one form of horse-racing, the poet represents Delphusa as dissuading Apollo from settling near her fountain because the sound of horses and chariots would disturb him. The Germans infer that this must have been written before the time when the Amphictyons, immediately after the sacred war (590 B.C.), established chariot races at the Pythian games. This seems to me founded on a mistake, for these games were not carried on at Delphi, which is quite inaccessible to chariots, and where the stadium is far too small for such races, but at a special hippodrome in the plain below, which Pausanias specially mentions,¹ so that it may always have been held that the god chose his remote and Alpine retreat in order to avoid such disturbance. The priests are told prophetically, at the close of the poem, that through their own fault they will become subject to a strange power, and this again is supposed to point to the events of the sacred war. But there is no certainty in these conjectures.

Both this and the former poem seem to have been considerably interpolated, as for example with the episode² of the birth of Typhon, which is quite in the manner of the *Theogony* of Hesiod. Other small inconsistencies may rather be ascribed to *naïveté* and want of critical spirit than to a diversity of poets. As the Delian hymn was intended for recitation at Delos, so the Pythian is clearly intended for some such purpose at Delphi,

¹ x. 37, 4.

² ii. vv. 127-77.

and seems not far removed in date from its forerunner. But as the Pythian contests were with the lyre, a Hesiodic poet could hardly have competed unless he abandoned his old custom of reciting without accompaniment; and indeed the complete silence of the hymn about the Pythian contests suggests some definite reason for not mentioning them.

§ 99. The *Hymns to Hermes* (iii.) and to *Aphrodite* (iv.) may be brought into comparison on account of their familiar handling of gods, though in other respects they are widely contrasted. The text of the former is the most corrupt of all the Hymns, so much so that G. Hermann and other destructive critics urge with great force their theory of its being a conglomerate of various short pieces by different authors. The opening lines are repeated almost verbatim in the lesser Hymn to Hermes, numbered xviii. in the collection; but it is clear from the critical discussion of the prefaces to Hesiod's poems, and from the many short procemia actually found in this collection, that these introductions were movable, and that the rejection of the preface entails no presumption against the unity of the main body of the poem. The Moscow MS. differs remarkably from the rest in its text of this poem; according to Hermann, because it followed another recension, according to Baumeister, with whom I agree, because the scribe copying the archetype was a learned man, and set himself to correct and emend what he thought corrupt.

The text of the *Hymn to Aphrodite* is, on the contrary, the purest and easiest of all, and it is only the perverse ingenuity of the Germans which has ventured to thrust upon us here their suspicions of interpolations. There appears to be also a considerable contrast between the two poems as to diction. While the Hymn to Aphrodite is in very pure Ionic—almost Homeric—Greek, and clearly composed in Asia Minor, the Hymn to Hermes abounds in phrases only to be found in Hesiod,¹ and shows evidence of Boeotian or Arcadian origin. Again, there is a good deal of humour, and of a low popular tone, about the latter, while this homely tone is not at all felt in the other. Nevertheless, these poems, as I have said, have an all-important feature which makes it suitable to connect

¹ Cf. Mure, ii. p. 344, note.

them together—I mean the bold and familiar handling of the foibles and passions of the gods. Their moral tone is perhaps lower than that of any other old Greek poem, if we except the episode called the lay of Demodocus, in the *Odyssey*—a poem which bears the most striking resemblance in tone and diction to the fourth hymn. The passion of the goddess is in both represented as a foible, but hardly as a fault, and her adventures in the hymn are represented as brought upon her by a sort of retaliation on the part of Zeus. The description of her progress through Mount Ida, her power over the lower animals (vv. 70, sq.), and her meeting with Anchises, are told with great beauty, but apparently without any feeling of reserve on the part of the poet.¹ It was not till Praxiteles that sculpture dared to represent the undraped beauty of the goddess in marble. Poetry cast away such restrictions far earlier. There is also a fine description of the old age of Tithonus (vv. 237-46), and of the life of trees as bound up with that of the wood-nymphs. The main object of the poem is to extol the family of Anchises and Æneas, whose alleged descendants (as is prophesied in the *Iliad*) were evidently important people in the poet's day.² We have no evidence where they ruled, or whether they encouraged Greek poetry.

The *Hymn to Hermes* does not describe such passion, and is an account of the birth and adventures of the god, setting forth his thieving and perjury with the most shameless effrontery. To the ordinary Greeks great ingenuity was enough at all times to palliate or even to justify dishonesty, and though Hesiod and the Delphic oracle raised their voices in favour of justice and truth, there can be no doubt that the nation was thoroughly depraved in this respect. The Hymn to Hermes goes through a variety of adventures of the god—his stealing of the oxen of Apollo immediately after his birth, his invention of the lyre, his trial and perjury before Zeus, and the amusement and good-nature of Apollo in being reconciled to him. The mention of the seven-stringed lyre has induced most critics to date the poem after Terpander's time, but, on the other side, it is declared

¹ See the opposite view in Sittl, *L.G.* i. p. 198.

² Fick (*B.B.* ix. 200) argues for its Cyprian attribution at the feasts of the goddess there.

absurd that the poet should describe as an original invention of the god a new improvement in the instrument made by a well-known man at a well-known date. It is therefore argued that the seven-stringed lyre was not unknown in ancient days in some parts of Greece, though not generally adopted by literary lyric poets till Terpander. This is indeed to be inferred from Pausanias, who says that Amphion naturalised the Lydian seven-stringed lyre in Greece. At all events, this improved lyre must have been in common use when the poem was composed, probably not before 600 B.C.

As to the literary merits of these hymns, authorities are divided. Most of the Germans place the hymn to Hermes very high, and think that but for its corruptions it would be the most original and striking of the collection. Mure, on the other hand, thinks the fourth to be the most beautiful of all the hymns, and almost worthy of Homer himself. Both seem to me to have great, but contrasted merits. The humour and variety of the one are perhaps equalled by the luxurious richness of the other. Both are precious relics of old Greek poetry, and curious evidences of the rapid decay of the old Greek religion. Shelley has left us a translation of the third as well as of some of the shorter hymns. His version is of course very poetical, but accentuates the comic element perhaps too strongly.

§ 100. The *Hymn to Demeter* (v.), of nearly 500 lines, is of a very different character, and is to be identified with some Athenian worship, either the Panathenaic festival, if there was any occasion at that festival for such a recitation, or some religious ceremony at Eleusis. The hymn narrates the carrying off of Persephone, who wandered in search of flowers through the Mysian plain, and was entranced with delight at the narcissus, which is described with great enthusiasm as being an important emblem in the Mysteries. The crying out of Persephone is heard by Hecate and Helios alone, from whom the distracted mother finds out what has happened to her daughter. But Demeter is still more wroth at hearing that it was done with the connivance or approval of Zeus, and she deserts the immortals to live among men. So she comes to Eleusis, where she sits by the wayside and meets the daughters of Keleus going

to draw water. They accost her with kindness, and she is installed as nurse of their infant brother Triptolemus.

It is not necessary to go at greater detail into the story, which is told in this hymn with singular clearness and beauty. Any difficulties which occur are due to the corruptions of our single MS., or to the covert allusions to the Mysteries which are evidently before the poet's mind all through the narration of the legend. The critics generally do not speak with sufficient warmth of the beauty of this poem, which is, in my opinion, far the noblest of the hymns. A good many Atticisms have been detected in it by the grammarians, but I am not aware of a single solid argument to prove its date, even approximately.¹ It was well known to the ancients, and is quoted four times by Pausanias, with considerable variations from our text, but these are probably due both to its corruption and to inaccuracy in Pausanias himself. This author also quotes an ancient hymn of Pamphos on the same legend, which seems to have been very similar in argument.

§ 101. Of the lesser hymns the longest (vii.) is that to Dionysus, which describes his adventure with pirates, whom he astonished and overcame by miracles, when they had captured and bound him on their ship. The critics think that the portraiture of the god as a youth points to the age of Praxiteles, because older Greek plastic art had uniformly made him of severe aspect, and apparently middle age.² I have shown above (p. 149) that in the case of Aphrodite poetry outran sculpture in its development, and I feel convinced that the change in the form of Dionysus also was adopted in poetry long before it was attempted, or perhaps could be attempted, in sculpture. The hymn seems certainly to have been known to Euripides, who builds some of the plot of his *Cyclops* on it, and this subject, perhaps even this detail, was borrowed from the older Aris-

¹ Baumeister (*Comm. in Hymn.* p. 280) conjectures it to be of the time of the Peisistratidæ, when epic poetry experienced a considerable revival. Fick (*B.B.* xvi. 27) has given reasons for placing it between 540 and 504 B.C.

² This story is beautifully illustrated in the frieze of the choragic monument of Lysicrates at Athens (erected 332 B.C.)—a monument which is now best studied in the drawings of Stuart and Revett, made a century ago, when the work was less shattered.

tias.¹ The next hymn (viii.), to Ares, is quite of a later and metaphysical turn. It abounds in strings of epithets, and rather celebrates the mental influences of the deity, than his personal adventures. But it is surely a satirical or comic poem, in which the epithets are consciously heaped together, and the conclusion is ridiculously *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. Yet it is attributed by most critics to the Orphic school, as is also Hymn xiv., *To the Mother of the Gods*; though these Homeric hymns differ widely from the Orphic hymns on the same subjects.

I will only mention among the rest that to Pan (xix.), which is supposed to have been composed after the time when the worship of Pan was introduced at Athens (490 B.C.). This little poem is remarkable as one of the few extant Greek works which show a love and sympathy for the beauties of nature, and which indulge the fancy in fairy pictures of bold cliffs and leafy glens peopled by dancing nymphs, and resounding with the echo of piping sweeter than the nightingale, and the voices of sportive and merry gods. It is common among English critics to assert that only in Euripides and Aristophanes of earlier poets can we find this peculiar and delightful form of imagination. The Hymn to Pan,² which reminds us strongly of

¹ Patin, *Études sur les tragiques grecs*, iv. 290.

² Ἀμφὶ μοι Ἑρμείαο φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα,
αἰγιόβην, δικέρωτα, φιλόκροτον, ὅστ' ἂν πῖση
δενδρήεντ' ἄμυδις φοιτᾷ χοροήθεσι Νύμφαις·
αἶτε κατ' αἰγίλιπος πέτρης στειβουσι κάρηνα
Πᾶν ἀνακεκλόμεναι, νόμιον θεόν, ἀγλαέθειρον,
αὐχμήενθ', ὃς πάντα λόφον νιφόμεντα λέλογχε,
καὶ κορυφὰς ὀρέων καὶ πετρήεντα κέλευθα·
φοιτᾷ δ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα διὰ ῥωπήϊα πυκνά,
ἄλλοτε μὲν βέλθοισιν ἐφεζόμενος μαλακοῖσιν,
ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ πέτρῃσιν ἐν ἡλιβάτοισι διοιχνεῖ,
ἄκροτάτην κορυφὴν μηλόσκοπον εἰσαναβαίνων.
πολλάκι δ' ἄργινόμεντα διέδραμεν οὖρεα μακρά,
πολλάκι δ' ἐν κνημοῖσι διήλασε, θήρας ἐναίρων,
ὄξέα δερκόμενος· τότε δ' ἔσπερος ἔκλαγεν οἷος
ἄγρης ἐξανιών, δονάκων ὑπο μοῦσαν ἀθύρων
ἦδυμον· οὐκ ἂν τόνγε παραδράμοι ἐν μελέεσσιν
ὄρνις, ἦτ' ἔαρος πολυανθέος ἐν πετάλοισιν
θρήνον ἐπιπροχέουσ' ἰάχει μελίγηρυν αἰοδῇν.
σὺν δέ σφιν τότε Νύμφαι ὄρεστιάδες, λιγυμολποι,
φοιτῶσαι πύκνα ποσσὶν ἐπὶ κρήνῃ μελανύδρῃ

Euripides' chorus (vv. 167 et seqq.) in the *Helena*, shows this limitation to be unfounded. The rest are short poems to various gods, very similar in character to the spurious opening lines of Hesiod's *Works*; one of them (xxv.) is even made up of lines from Hesiod's *Theogony*. The short Hymns (xiii. and xviii.), to Hermes and Demeter are mere selections from the greater poems in honour of the same gods.

It appears from this brief review that the so-called *Hymns* are a very various and motley collection of poems to the gods sung by rhapsodes on secular occasions. In some cases these preludes were expanded into independent poems. The older and Ionic pieces breathe a familiar and very secular handling of the adventures of the gods; the Hesiodic pieces were more serious and intended to instruct the hearers in theology; while the semi-Orphic pieces were still more reflective and solemn. But they all assume the tone and style of the Ionic epic school. It is not impossible, in spite of the later complexion of some few of them, that the collection was made by the commission of Peisistratus when they were editing or collecting the remains of both Homer and Hesiod.

§ 102. This kind of poetry was revived, as might be expected, at Alexandria, and we have still five hymns extant from the wreck of Alexandrian literature, by the celebrated Callimachus,¹ whose wonderful fertility was not destined to produce much permanent fruit. These hymns are to Zeus, Apollo, Artemis, Delos, and Demeter respectively. They are all of considerable length, those to Artemis and Delos being the longest, but none of them are interesting. They celebrate, like their Homeric prototypes, the birth and early fortunes of the god addressed; but in the case of Delos, the wanderings and sufferings of Latona, who is, however, encouraged by the consolations uttered by her unborn

μέλπονται· κορυφήν δὲ περιστένει οὖρεος ἡχώ—
δαίμων δ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα χορῶν, τοτὲ δ' ἐς μέσον ἔρπων,
πυκνὰ ποσὶν διέπει· λαῖφος δ' ἐπὶ νῶτα δαφεινὸν
λυγκὸς ἔχει, λιγυρῆσιν ἀγαλλόμενος φρένα μολπαῖς—
ἐν μαλακῷ λειμῶνι, τόθι κρόκος ἢ δ' ὑάκινθος
εὐώδης θαλέθων καταμίσγεται ἄκριτα ποίη.

¹ Bergk thinks (*ZG.* i. p. 749) that Callimachus imitated not the secular hymns, but the old religious *nomos*—on what evidence I know not.

child ! Perhaps the best of these over-learned and frigid poems is the Hymn to Demeter, which, unlike the rest, is in Doric dialect, and which describes with some humour the insatiable hunger of Erysichthon, with which Demeter visited him for cutting down a poplar in her sacred grove. The text has been lately edited, with more care than it deserves, by Meineke (Berlin, 1861); there is also an old metrical translation by Dodd (London, 1755). But modern scholars have long since decided that Callimachus, however famous among the Romans, is not to be regarded as a classical author, though he had the honour of being printed by Const. Lascaris, at Florence, in 1494, in capital letters, among the very earliest Greek texts.

§ 103. We have, in the collection of so-called Idylls ascribed to Theocritus, three poems which may properly be considered in connection with the Homeric Hymns. One of them (Idyll xxii.) is professedly a hymn to the Dioscuri, celebrating the victory of Pollux over Amycus, and of Castor over Lynceus. The work is both well conceived and executed, but Theocritus' mimic talent makes his dialogue between Pollux and Amycus rather more dramatic than was the fashion of the old hymns. There are also picturesque touches (vv. 37, sq.), which speak the poet of the pastoral Idylls. Of the two poems (xxiv. and xxv.) on Heracles, the first, which is called the *Infant Heracles*, and narrates his killing of the snakes in his cradle, is very like the Hymns, especially that to Demeter, though composed in the Doric dialect. It is not certain that we have the end of the poem preserved. The second poem is somewhat more epic in form, and is probably a fragment of a longer work, or composed with a larger plan. It narrates the visit of Heracles to Augeias of Elis, where he tells the king's son his adventure with the Nemean lion. There are bucolic expressions scattered all through this epic poem, which seem to vouch for its authorship. Many critics are disposed to view it as a mere fragment of Peisander or of Panyasis or Rhianus. Nevertheless, as the poem stands, it detaches one or two adventures of a god, and tells them in epic form, so that it is fairly to be connected

¹ There is an admirable study on Callimachus by A. Couat, who devotes most of his volume entitled *La Poésie alexandrine*, Paris 1883, to that poet.

with the professed imitations of the Hymns in the other Theocritean poems just mentioned. They all show not only a perfect handling of epic style and manner, but considerable force and beauty, and are quite worthy of the great name of their author.

§ 104. Of the *Παίγνια*, or sportive effusions attributed to Homer, I have already discussed the *Battle of the Frogs and Mice*. It is greatly to be regretted that a much more important poem, the *Margites*, has not been preserved, inasmuch as it was treated as the genuine work of Homer, even by Aristotle, who quotes it more than once, and sees in it (though falsely) the first germ of comedy.¹ It was a humorous description of a foolish young man, dabbling in various knowledge, but ignorant of all practical matters, and making terrible blunders in the more delicate situations of life. From the extract quoted in the good editions of Suidas,² it seems that the poem was not very decent in its wit. There was a very remarkable feature about its form—a feature which has exercised modern critics greatly. Iambic lines were inserted at irregular intervals among the hexameters of which it mainly consisted. As Suidas and Eudocia attribute the poem to Pigres,³ it has been thought that he may have added or interlarded these lines. This is the conclusion to which Bernhardt comes, without positively asserting Pigres to be the individual interpolator; but the conclusion is not very safe, for in another of the *παίγνια*, the *Εἰρεσιώνη*, we have the same feature, and there is no reason to believe that iambics were invented by Archilochus; they were rather an old popular form of verse adopted by him for literary purposes.⁴ The *Margites* was held in high esteem by the ancients, and was quoted by Cratinus, possibly Aristophanes, Callimachus, and the stoic Zeno. By Dio Chrysostom, apparently quoting from the latter, it was regarded as a juvenile work of Homer. In Suidas' day it seems to have been already lost. The mere

¹ Arist. *Poet.* 4; *Nic. Eth.* vi. 7.

² *Sub voc.* Μαργίτης.

³ *Sub voc.* Πίγρης, the brother of the famous Artemisia, who is said to have interpolated the *Iliad* with pentameters.

⁴ The mixture of hexameters and iambics is to be seen in the 125th frag. (an epigram) of Simonides, ed. Bergk.

names of two other poems classed under this head are preserved, the 'Επικιχλίδες and the 'Επτάπεκτος αἶζ.

§ 105. In the pseudo-Herodotean Life of Homer there are preserved several other curious little poems, and fragments of poems, which were falsely ascribed to the great poet, but which are to us inestimable as showing a glimpse of the popular songs of early Greece. There is a beautiful epitaph on King Midas of Phrygia, who had taken a daughter of Agamemnon, despot of Kyme, to wife, and who died at the time of the Kimmerian invasion (*circ.* 680 B.C.). It is strictly an epigram on a bronze statue set over the tomb.¹ There is also an address to the poet's home, Smyrna, which he left on account of the little appreciation of his art, which is probably (as Bergk well says) the earliest *échantillon* of lyric feeling, though clothed in epic verse. It is entitled *to the Kymæans*, which is thought a mistake, arising from the false reading Κύμης for Σμύρνης in the end of the poem. The poems numbered i. and ii. are fragments of similar personal addresses. Of the rest two deserve special notice—that entitled Κάμινος or Κεραμεῖς, a little address of a wandering minstrel to the potters as they are putting their work into the oven, praying success for them if they reward him, but calling upon a strange assembly of demons, Sabaktes and his comrades, Circe and the Centaurs, to spoil the work and crack the ware if they treat him with stinginess. The second, called Εἰρεσιώνη,² is a song of

- ¹ Χαλκήν παρθένος εἰμι, Μίδεω δ' ἐπὶ σήματι κείμεναι·
 ἔστ' ἂν ὕδωρ τε βέη, καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήλη,
 ἡέλιός τ' ἀνιῶν φαίνη, λαμπρὴ τε σελήνη,
 καὶ ποταμοὶ πλήθωσιν, ἀνακλῦζ' δὲ θάλασσα·
 αὐτοῦ τῇδε μένουσα πολυκλαύτῳ ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
 ἀγγέλω παριοῦσι, Μίδης ὅτι τῇδε τέθαιπται.

It was by some attributed to Cleobulus. It was known to Simonides, and is referred to by Plato (*Phædrus*, p. 264) as being a sort of poetical *Round*, in which the verses can be transposed without spoiling the sense.

- ² Δῶμα προστραπόμεσθ' ἀνδρὸς μέγα δυνάμενιο,
 ὃς μέγα μὲν δύναται, μέγα δὲ βρέμει ὀλβιος αἶε.
 αὐταὶ ἀνακλίνεσθε θύραι· πλοῦτος γὰρ ἔσεισιν
 πολλὰς, σὺν πλοῦτῳ δὲ καὶ εὐφροσύνη τεθαλυῖα,
 εἰρήνη τ' ἀγαθὴ, ὅσα δ' ἄγγεα, μεστὰ μὲν εἴη,
 κυρβαίη δ' αἰεὶ κατὰ καρδόπου ἔρποι μάζα.

children going from house to house in autumn during Apollo's feast, and levying what they can get, just as poor children now go about on St. Stephen's or May-day. As already observed, this little piece ends with iambic trimeters. It was probably sung at Samos, but its age is unknown. These two poems, both in the practices they imply, and in the superstitions they mention, give us one of the few glimpses we have into the life of the lower classes in early times. They have nothing to do with Homer or with epic poetry, but as we have no class of poetry or of literature where they could find a natural place, they may still hold the place assigned to them by the ancients, as venerable fragments of what the common people sang, while the rhapsodists were reciting their refined epics at the courts of kings and nobles.

§ 106. It may be well finally to dispose in a few words of the external history of the collection. Our oldest testimony to the existence of these Hymns is a citation by Thucydides (iii. 104) from the first (to the Delian Apollo). His quotation is remarkable for differing considerably in expression, though not at all in sense, from our MSS., so that there appears to have been much liberty allowed the rhapsodists in the rendering of their texts. The historian goes on to cite the famous personal passage in which the poet describes himself as 'the blind old man of Chios' rocky isle'—a passage which Thucydides, and with him all the ancients, considered as clear proof of the blindness and of the Chian parentage of Homer. Accordingly, though seldom cited in antiquity, the hymns generally went under the name of Homer. There seems to be another allusion to the same hymn in Aristophanes' *Clouds*,

τοῦ παιδὸς δὲ γυνή κατὰ δίφραδα βήσεται ὕμνιν,
 ἡμίονοι δ' ἄξουσι κραταίποδες ἐς τόδε δῶμα·
 αὐτὴ δ' ἰστὸν ὑφαίνοι ἐπ' ἡλέκτρῳ βεβανία.
 νεῦμαί τοι, νεῦμαι ἐνιαύσιος, ὥστε χελιδῶν
 ἔστηκ' ἐν προθύροις, ψιλὴ πόδας· ἀλλὰ φέρ' αἰψα
 πέρσαι τῷδ' Ἀπόλλωνι γυιὰτιδο
 καί,
 εἰ μὲν τι δώσεις· εἰ δὲ μὴ, οὐχ ἔστηξομεν·
 οὐ γὰρ συνοικήσοντες ἐνθάδ' ἤλθομεν.

and to the Pythian or second hymn in the *Knights* (v. 1015), where he quotes (apparently) v. 265¹; but after his day, the first allusions, and those indirect, appear in a corresponding hymn of Callimachus, and a note of Antigonus Carystius about lyre strings. Though five or six scholia, gathered from the *Iliad*, Pindar, and Aristophanes, allude to them, we do not possess a single remark upon them directly ascribed to the great Alexandrian critics. Diodorus quotes the hymns generally as Homer's, and so does Philodemus, in one of the recovered Herculanean fragments. Pausanias also speaks of Homer's hymns generally, but specially cites that to the Delian Apollo, that to the Pythian, and that to Demeter. Athenæus cites the Hymn to Apollo, but hesitates about its authorship. The scholiast on Pindar ascribes it to Kinæthon of Chios. Suidas and the *Lives* of Herodotus and Homer ascribe them without criticism to Homer.

Thus we find almost no quotations from them in antiquity. There is very seldom a reference to any other hymn but that to the Delian Apollo. Yet about the first century B.C. we find the *Hymns of Homer* mentioned, and Pausanias seems specially acquainted with that to Demeter. The authors of good Greek scholia cite them, and then we lose all trace of them till the time of Suidas.

§ 107. *Bibliographical.* Our extant MSS. are late, none of them earlier than the fourteenth century. Of these the most remarkable is that found at Moscow by Matthiæ in 1780, and now at Leyden, for it contains at the opening a fragment to Dionysus, and next the famous Hymn to Demeter, not elsewhere preserved. Nevertheless, a good authority, Baumeister, prefers the Laurentian codex (Plut. xxxii. 45), of about the same date, for purity of text and general merit. All the extant MSS. seem taken from one older copy, now lost; but the Moscow copy was written by a more learned scribe than the rest, and therefore more seriously interpolated and emended.² The arche-

¹ v. 575, where Homer is said to have represented Iris winged; cf. the schol. on the line, who refers to the Hymns.

² A Codex Estensis at Parma is now supposed to be important, but not yet collated, except by Gemoll.

type was already damaged, as is shown by the short fragment of the Hymn to Dionysus, with which the Moscow codex opens. But, before it was again copied by the writers of our other codices, it had lost several more of the early pages, which contained the Hymn to Demeter. From the mistakes made in our MSS. we can infer that even their archetype was not very old, and certainly not written in capitals. They were first printed at Florence in 1488 in Demetrius' Chalcondylas' *editio princeps* of Homer. Then follow H. Stephens, Joshua Barnes, and the *Epistola critica* of D. Ruhnken (1749). After the discovery of the Moscow codex (now Leidensis), we have, among others, editions by F. A. Wolf (Halle, 1796), by Ilgen, a very complete book, by Matthiæ, Godf. Hermann, and Franke, almost all with the *Batrachomyomachia* and Trifles; then the Hymns alone with commentary by A. Baumeister (Lips. 1860), who has also revised the text in the Teubner series; Gemoll, *Die hom. Hymnen* (Leip. 1886), is now the best editor of the text. There is a remarkable article by Aug. Fick in *Bezzenberger's Beiträge*, ix. 195, sq. (1884), where he analyses the hymns, and gives his theory of the text. He argues that two of the longer hymns (II. IV.), composed, the one for Delos, the other probably for the Cyprian festivals of Aphrodite, show in their metric a consistent observance of the digamma, while I., III. and V. do not. These latter, then, he considers to have been originally composed in Ionic Greek. He appends a 'purified' text of the greater and lesser Hymns to Aphrodite, that to Hermes, and that to Demeter. Of translations the only older one was that of Chapman (reprinted 1858), of course without the hymn to Demeter; but this latter has suggested to Mr. Swinburne one of his finest *Poems and Ballads*. Mr. Edgar has just published (Edinburgh, 1891) a new prose version, of considerable merit, of the whole collection.

CHAPTER IX.

THE LATER HISTORY OF EPIC POETRY.¹

§ 108. WITH the so-called cyclic poets, the natural course of epic poetry had reached the close of its development. Other species of poetry arose and satisfied the wants of a newer age. The historical sense of the Greeks, late in growth and slow in development, at last substituted prose narrative of real facts for the poetical treatment of myths. Nevertheless, the unsurpassed greatness of the old masterpieces perpetually tempted men of learning and refinement to try a new development on these models, which had shown a sustained grandeur that no succeeding form or metre could ever attain. But all these attempts were, nationally speaking, complete failures, though some of them which remain delight us by their beauty and the elegance of their execution.² They were in ancient days the study of the learned few, in later the arena for displaying grammatical accuracy and artificial culture. Even

¹ This chapter offers no interest to the general reader, and Apollonius is the only literary figure which it contains. But some information concerning the later epic poets may fairly be demanded by the special student, perhaps even because they are obscure.

² Choerilus, in an extant fragment, probably from the opening of his *Perseis*, states the difficulties of the later epic poets with good sense and feeling :—

᾽Α μάκαρ, ὅστις ἔην κείνον χρόνον Ἰδρις αἰοιδῆς,
Μουσάων θεράπων, ὅτ' ἀκήρατος ἦν ἔτι λειμών·
νῦν δ' ὅτε πάντα δέδασται, ἔχουσι δὲ πείρατα τέχνη,
ῥστατοι ὥστε δρόμου κατελείπομεθ', οὐδέ πῃ ἔστι
πάντῃ παπταίνοντα νεοζυγὲς ἄρμα πελάσσαι.

in the last agonies of expiring heathenism, the school of Egypt poured out its turbid utterance of mystery and magic in long mythological epics, which are now unknown save to the curious student of obscure books. All these epics are outside the proper course of the national literature of Greece, which seems always to have exhausted all the originality in each kind of writing before it passed on to the next. Nor do they fall properly within the scope of this book, which is concerned with that literature which was in Greece national, and not the heritage of the few. It seems well, therefore, to dispose of them briefly here, in order to write the history of succeeding kinds of literature without interruption. Those who desire full and accurate information on this very dry and unprofitable subject will do well to consult the elaborate and unwearied work of Bernhardt, who has devoted 120 very long pages to a thorough examination of these poems and fragments.¹

§ 109. The earliest development of this kind seems to have been in Asia Minor about a century after the chief cyclic poets, and the favourite subject the adventures of Heracles. These were specially treated in a poem called *Heracleia* by PEISANDER of Cameirus, a poet of early but unknown date, whose authority on the labours of Heracles is often invoked, and who was the first to arm him with the club and lion's skin. ASIUS of Samos seems to have been an equally early genealogical poet, who is quoted by Duris as describing the luxury of the Ionians at Samos in terms not unlike Thucydides' account of the old Athenians. Athenæus cites a few comic lines from an elegy of the same poet, and Pausanias refers to him on obscure genealogical questions about local heroes. These two poets are generally placed much earlier than those about to be mentioned, and Dübner² believes there was a long sleep of epic poetry, till the excitement of the Persian wars caused it to wake up again. Herodorus of Heraclea, though a prose writer, was like them in subjects and style.

PANYASIS, uncle of Herodotus, a man of political note

¹ *LG.* ii. 1, pp. 538-458.

² In his Preface to the Didot ed. of the Epic fragments, following Suidas' ὅς σβεσθείσαν τὴν ποιητικὴν ἐπανήγαγε.

at Halicarnassus, where he fought for the freedom of the town against the tyrant Lygdamis, gained a good deal of temporary celebrity by another *Heracleia*, in fourteen books. Considerable fragments of a social nature are quoted from it by Stobæus and Athenæus, which specially refer to the use and abuse of wine-drinking. They are elegantly written, and remind us strongly of the elegiac fragments on the same subject by Xenophanes and Theognis. He was also, according to Suidas, author of elegiac poems, in six books, called *Ionica*, on the antiquities of Athens, and especially on the Ionic migration. This work was not without influence on his nephew Herodotus.

His younger contemporary, ANTIMACHUS of Colophon, lived up to the end of the Peloponnesian War as a very old man, and has been already mentioned (p. 31) as one of the learned critics who published a special edition of Homer, quoted in the Venetian scholia. His great interest in Homer led him to attempt a learned and scholastic imitation (for original genius he had none) in a very long and tedious *Thebais*. His *Lyde*, an elegiac poem, does not belong to the present chapter. He is said by Plutarch, in a suspicious anecdote (*Vit. Lys.* 12), to have contended for a prize in a laudatory poem on Lysander, and, being defeated, to have destroyed the poem. But Plato, he adds, being then young and a personal admirer of Antimachus, consoled him with animadverting on the blindness of his critics. Plato is further said to have wished for a collection of his poems. Hadrian preferred him to Homer, and introduced him to notice after he had long been forgotten. It was left for Mr. Paley to tell us that the little-noticed edition of Antimachus, the friend and contemporary of Plato, was perhaps the first publication of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in their present form! The extant fragments of Antimachus with other epic poets are collected with care by Dübner at the end of the *Hesiod* in the Didot collection. They have no literary interest, being chiefly citations to explain obscure words, which he affected, obscure myths, which he illustrated or narrated, or lastly, phrases either borrowed from Homer, or contrary to Homeric use. The Alexandrian critics constantly quote him, and greatly admired him, and he may

fairly be regarded the model or master of the Alexandrian epic poets. This did not save him from the criticism and ridicule of Callimachus. Quintilian¹ speaks of him as being indeed generally thought by the learned as second to Homer, but as second by an enormous interval. Plutarch, in his tract on Talkativeness, gives an amusing example of a babbler flooding the man who asks him a question with his answer, which comprises a whole history, 'especially if he have read Antimachus of Colophon.'

CHÆRILUS (of Samos also), a younger contemporary of Herodotus, and said by Plutarch to have been intimate with Lysander, is remarkable for having attempted a great novelty—to relate in the epic form the very subject with which Herodotus founded Greek history. His *Perseïs* sang the struggle of Hellenedom with Persia. Its style is said to have been less artificial than that of Antimachus, who was his rival in the estimation of the learned. Only three fragments of interest are left us from this poet, that above cited, then his description of the Jews in the army of Xerxes—an inaccurate picture, but very interesting from its early date—and lastly a striking sentence, supposed to be spoken by Xerxes after his defeat.² If a judgment upon such scanty evidence were allowable, I should be disposed to agree with the minority, who placed him above Antimachus.

§ 110. These three authors, together with the older Asiæ and Peisander, are the obscure representatives of the Greek epic poetry down to the Alexandrian period, when there was larger room for literary revivals, as the original genius of the nation was exhausted. Accordingly, the only later epic which has ever enjoyed any real celebrity is the *Argonautica* of the Alexandrian APOLLONIUS,³ commonly called the Rhodian,

¹ x. 1, § 53, Plutarch *de Garr.* cap. xxi.

² χερσὶν δ' ὕλβον ἔχω, κύλικος τρύφης ἀμφὶς ἑαγός,
ἀνδρῶν δαιτυμόνων ναυάγιον, οἳά τε πολλὰ
πνεῦμα Διωνύσοιο πρὸς Ἴβριος ἔκβαλεν ἀκτάς.

³ Rhianus, the editor of Homer, and contemporary of Eratosthenes, was the author of several voluminous epics, from one of which, the *Messeniacæ*, Pausanias quotes the romantic legends concerning Aristomenes, the great Messenian hero.

from his long residence and citizenship there. He was a pupil of the famous Callimachus, afterwards his bitterest opponent on æsthetic questions, and hence his personal enemy, on whom Callimachus wrote a bitter libel, the *Ibis*.¹ Ultimately he succeeded Eratosthenes as librarian in Alexandria. Apollonius, indeed, deserves more than a passing notice. The aspect of criticism has veered constantly as regards him, nor can his position be yet considered finally determined. For, on the one hand, we find a good many enthusiastic admirers, especially among older scholars, who see in him a man of genius, and in his poems not only a revival of an old and splendid style, but a revival with distinct and original features. By them he is praised as one of the greatest lights in Greek literature. On the other hand, the general neglect of later critics, backed by that of our classical public, consigns him to that oblivion in which all Alexandrian work, except that of Theocritus, has lain during the present century.² This judgment is so completely based upon neglect, not upon critical censure, that we may well hesitate to endorse it, and may turn to a brief examination of a work once so famous, and so largely commented on in the days of the scholiasts, but which is now almost a novelty to the majority of our scholars.

The poem³ opens with a catalogue of the heroes, and a very picturesque description of their departure, amid the tears and sympathy of their relations (i. 247, sq.). It then proceeds to narrate their various adventures on the journey. The writing is simple, and little ornamented, as if the poet's main object had been to record geographical and mythical lore, and not to fascinate the reader by his fancy. There are few and short digressions throughout the work, too few, indeed, for an epic on the old model. The more ornate passages in the first book are the descriptions of the song of Or-

¹ Cf. Mr. Ellis's learned article on this quarrel in the *Academy* for Aug. 30, 1879.

² The same variance of opinion existed of old; while Virgil must have greatly admired him, and Varro Atacinus translated him, Quintilian speaks of his poem as *non contemnendum opus æquali quadam mediocritate*.

³ It is arranged in four books, but each of them so long as to equal two books of Homer. The whole amounts to some 5,800 lines.

pheus, which is justly described as *Theogonic* in character, of the cloak of Jason, and lastly some similes which are not very apt (as the scholiasts note), except a very fine one comparing Heracles, when he hears of the loss of Hylas, to a bull maddened by a gadfly.¹ It may, indeed, be here remarked that the poet's similes are rather introduced for their prettiness than for their aptness, and that when he expands one taken from Homer (as in ii. 543, sq.) he does not improve it.

In the second book, which continues the adventures of the Argo, the description of the miseries of Phineus is very interesting, as is also the stirring account of the passage of the Symplegades. Various curious notices, such as that of the 'black country' of the Chalybes and the *couvade* of the Tibareni,² maintain our interest, which is, however, the same kind of interest as that excited by Xenophon's prose narrative on the same topics towards the close of his *Anabasis*.

In the third book we are introduced to the second great subject, which is combined with the adventures of the Argonauts—the passion of Medea. It is this intensely dramatic element which gives the poem its main value, and is an unique phenomenon in old Greek epic literature. This book is so vastly superior to all the rest, that we at once suspect the existence of some great model, from which Apollonius must have copied his great and burning scenes. But we look in vain through scholiasts and older poets for such a model. Sophocles' *Colchians*, which were on this subject, certainly did not make the psychological drawing of Medea prominent, or we must have heard it from the commentators either on Apollonius, or on Euripides' *Medea*. This latter picture is quite distinct from that of Apollonius, and he has not borrowed from it. There is, indeed, a sort of modernness, a minuteness of psychological analysis in Apollonius, which we seek in vain even in Euripides, the most advanced of the classical poets. The scene where Medea determines in her agony to commit suicide, but recoils with the reaction of a strong youthful nature from death, is the ancient parallel, if not the prototype, of the

¹ 496, sq., vv. 721–68, and vv. 1265, sq.

² 178, sq., and especially vv. 305–6, 551, sq., v. 1002.

splendid scene near the opening of Goethe's *Faust*, and is well worth reading.¹

It is very strange that the third book of the *Argonautica* has not maintained a high place in public esteem. Adverse critics note that the character of Jason fades out before the stronger Medea, and that he is the prototype of Virgil's *Æneas*,²

Ἡ καὶ φωριαμὸν μετεκίαθεν, ἥ ἔνι πολλὰ
φάρμακά οἱ τὰ μὲν ἐσθλὰ, τὰ δὲ ραιστήρι' ἔκειτο.
ἐνθεμένη δ' ἐπὶ γούνατ' ὀδύρετο. δεῦε δὲ κόλπους
ἄλληκτον δακρύοισι, τὰ δ' ἔρρεεν ἀσταγες αὐτῶς,
αἶν' ὀλοφυρομένης τὸν ἐδὼ μόρον. ἦτο δ' ἥ γε
φάρμακα λέξασθαι θυμοφθόρα, τόφρα πάσαιτο.
ἦδη καὶ δεσμοὺς ἀνελύετο φωριαμοῖο,
ἐξελέειν μεμαυῖα δυσάμμορος — ἀλλὰ οἱ ἄφνω
δεῖμ' ὀλοδὸν στυγεροῖο κατὰ φρένας ἦλθ' Ἀΐδαο.
ἔσχετο δ' ἀμφασίῃ δηρὸν χρόνον, ἀμφὶ δὲ πᾶσαι
θυμηδεῖς βιότοιο μεληδόνες ἰνδάλλοντο.
μνήσατο μὲν τερπνῶν, ὅσ' ἐνὶ ζωῷσι πέλονται,
μνήσαθ' ὀμηλικῆς περιγηθείας, οἷά τε κούρη·
καὶ τέ οἱ ἥλιος γλυκίων γένετ' εἰσορᾶσθαι
ἢ πάρος, εἰ ἐτεόν γε νόφ' ἐπεμαίεθ' ἕκαστα.
καὶ τὴν μὲν βὰ πάλιν σφετέρων ἀποκάθθετο γούνων,
Ἥρης ἐννεσίῃσι μετάρτροπος, οὐδ' ἔτι βουλὰς
ἄλλη δοιάζεσκεν· ἐέλδετο δ' αἰψὰ φανήνα.
ἡὼ τελλομένην, ἵνα οἱ θελκτήρια δοίῃ
φάρμακα συνθεσίῃσι καὶ ἀντήσειεν ἐς ὥπῃν.
πυκνὰ δ' ἀνὰ κληΐδας ἑὼν λύεσκε θυράων,
αἶγλην σκεπτομένη· τῇ δ' ἀσπάσιον βάλε φέγγος
Ἥριγενῆς, κίνυντο δ' ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον ἕκαστοι.

Other remarkable passages are vv. 615, sq., and 961-71.

ἐκ δ' ἄρα οἱ κραδίῃ στηθέων πέσεν, ὕμματα δ' αὐτῶς
ἤχλυσαν· θερμὸν δὲ παρηΐδας εἶλεν ἔρευθος.
γούνατα δ' οὐτ' ὀπίσω οὔτε προπάροιθεν αἰεραὶ
ἔσθενεν, ἀλλ' ὑπένερθε πάγῃ πόδας. αἱ δ' ἄρα τείως
ἀμφίπολοι μάλα πᾶσαι ἀπὸ σφείων ἐλίσσθεν.
τῷ δ' ἄνεψ καὶ ἀναυδοὶ ἐφέστασαν ἀλλήλοισιν,
ἢ δρυσὶν ἢ μακρῇσιν ἐξειδόμενοι ἐλάτῃσιν,
αἶτε παράσσον ἔκηλοι ἐν οὖρεσιν ἐρρίζωνται
νηνέμῃ· μετὰ δ' αὖτις ὑπὸ ριπῆς ἀνέμοιο
κινύμεναι ὁμάδῃσαν ἀπείριτον· ὥς ἄρα τῷ γε
μέλλον ἄλῃς φθέγγασθαι ὑπὸ πνοιῇσιν Ἑρῳτος.

² Indeed Virgil's obligations to Apollonius may be traced on every page of the *Æneid*.

but this tradition was already established by Euripides in his *Medea*.

The fourth book returns to the fabulous adventures of the heroes, during which Medea only appears occasionally, and generally as supplicating their sympathy or reproaching them for their coldness in protecting her from the pursuit of her father. But the main interest to modern readers is gone. The poet often lets his own person appear, and even once apologises for telling an improbable myth.¹ Two picturesque scenes, the playing of Eros and Ganymede, and the description of the Hesperides with the wounded dragon,² are evidently drawn from celebrated pictures, or, as some think, from groups of statuary. The frequent breaking off with 'why should I pursue the subject further,' or some such excuse, also points to the modern condition of the poet, encumbered with an endless store of traditions. His slightly veiled scepticism produces a similar impression.

§ III. *Bibliographical*. As to MSS., the principal one, which far exceeds all the rest in value, is in that most famous of all books, the Plut. xxxii. 9, of the Laurentian library at Florence, which contains a copy of the tenth century, along with the equally invaluable MSS. of Æschylus and Sophocles. There are twenty-five others known, at the Vatican, at Paris, and elsewhere. But all critical work must depend upon the Medicean codex. From it the *editio princeps* of Iascaris (in capital letters, Florence, 1496) was prepared, the Aldine (Venet. 1521) from the three Vatican MSS. Then comes the edition of Stephanus. There are, besides, editions by Brunck, Shaw (Oxon. 1777), and Schaefer. The newer are Wellauer's text, scholia and complete indices (Leipsig, 1828), Lehrs' (with Hesiod, &c. ed. Didot), Merkel's critical text (in Teubner's series, 1872), and Keil and Merkel's edition in 1854, with critical notes, and all the scholia—a fine book. In all these editions the Greek scholia form the most important element. Those of the Florentine MS. are very old and valuable, and are said at the end of the book to be selected from Lucillus Tarræus, Sophocles, and Theon. These men's notes are chiefly on mythological lore, but also give many valuable explanations,

¹ iv. 1379.

² iii. 114, sq., and iv. 1395, sq.

and, especially on the first book, cite the version of the poet's earlier edition which was then still extant. They criticise the speeches from a rhetorical aspect, and occasionally censure the similes, which they analyse with prosaic accuracy. Perhaps the most curious point in them is their frequent objecting to the poet's use of pronominal adjectives, which they roundly (and I think rightly) assert he did not understand.¹ The Paris MSS. contain a great many grammatical additions of later date. There are said to be three English translations, by Fawkes, Greene (1780), and Preston (1803), the last of which is a very scholarly work. They have fallen into such oblivion as to be now rare, even in large libraries.

§ 112. I know not whether it is worth wearying the reader with the later history of epic poetry. But as this obscure and feeble after-growth will give some idea of the sort of contrast which exists between classical and post-classical literature, I will for once inflict upon him a page of names and titles. These will serve me as a good apology for having avoided any fuller treatment of the Alexandrian epoch.

In the age of Apollonius, we have the epic studies among the poems of Theocritus, which have been already mentioned, but they seem to me more in the style of the Homeric Hymns than of the longer Homeric epics. They are careful and very perfect studies by the learned Alexandrian of the old epic style in short and complete episodes—in fact, idylls in the strictest sense of the term.

The *Europe* of Moschus (about 3rd cent. A.D.) seems to be an epic idyll of the same kind, of great elegance and finish, but with the erotic element more prominent than would have been natural to the real epic age. The description of the basket of Europe (vv. 37–63) is elaborated almost like that of the shields of Achilles and Heracles, and perhaps marks the contrast in the old and the new epic significantly enough. In the same category may be classed the *Megara*, or dialogue, of 125 lines, between Megara and Alcmene, concerning the absent Heracles, which is attributed to the same poet. This poem, like most of the short epic fragments of the Alexandrian epoch,

¹ Cf. schol. on ii. 544; iii. 186, 395, 600, 795; iv. 1327.

is not a whole in itself, but a sort of fragment, as it were, intended for a longer poem. This *Megara* ends with the dream related by Alcmena, which evidently portends the death of Heracles. These somewhat monotonous but elegant exercises will be most easily consulted in Ahrens' *Bucolici* (Teubner, 1875), where, however, too many of the Theocritean collection are called spurious, and printed at the end of the volume.

§ 113. From this period onward there is a long gap in our epic records, though we know that sophists and grammarians paid much attention to this style, and that the Indian adventures of Alexander gave rise to a taste for Indian and other Oriental fables, and especially descriptions of the Indian adventures of Bacchus. But we find no enduring result till the beginning of the fifth century, when an epic school was founded, principally in Upper Egypt, and of whom two representatives are well known—Nonnus and Musæus. There are several others mentioned in the fuller literature of the time. First, Quintus Smyrnæus (called *Calaber*, from the finding there of the MS.), who wrote a continuation of Homer in fourteen books, thus taking up the work of the cyclic poets, who were probably lost before his time. Then Tryphiodorus, who wrote an *Odyssey* and an extant *Capture of Troy*, in some 700 lines, and Colluthus, who wrote a *Rape of Helen*. These latter were Egyptians, and lived in the fifth or sixth century. They can be conveniently studied in the Didot collection, in which they are all printed after Hesiod.¹ But these works are not worth describing. Nonnus only, standing between the living and the dead, composing, on the one hand, his long epic on the adventures of Dionysus, and, on the other, his paraphrase of St. John's Gospel into Homeric hexameters, is a most interesting figure, though beyond the scope of the historian of Greek classical literature. Even the life of Christ

¹ Before the publication of this most useful volume (edited by F. S. Lehrs and Dübner), the later epics, and the fragments of the earlier, were very inaccessible, and only to be found in old uncritical or stray modern editions. Most unaccountably, the epic of Nonnus is excluded from this otherwise complete collection, which includes even Tzetzes.

was put together in Homeric hexameters, called *Centones Homerici*, which were attributed to the Empress Eudocia, and thought worthy of being printed by Aldus (1501) and Stephens (1568), but apparently as Christian literature.

The *Hero and Leander* of Musæus has, perhaps, maintained a higher place and greater popularity than any of the poems of this later age, and deserves it from the exceeding sweetness and pathos of both style and story. But it is hard to find a reader who has ever seen the original, though it has been immortalised by Byron in his *Bride of Abydos*, and thus kept alive in modern memories.

Perhaps some mention should be made of the *Alexandra* of Lycophron, an account of the prophecies of Alexandra, daughter of Priam, made to her father by a domestic, so abstruse and filled with recondite learning, that but for the existence of good scholia and a later paraphrase, we should hardly understand a word of it. As regards the name Alexandra, it was doubtless intended for Cassandra. Pausanias (iii. 19, 5; 25, 3) tells us that at Amyclæ and at Leuctra she was known and worshipped under that name.

CHAPTER X.

THE RISE OF PERSONAL POETRY AMONG THE GREEKS.¹

§ 114. THERE is a sort of general impression produced by the marked divisions of Greek Literature in our handbooks, that the newer kinds of poetry did not arise till the epic had decayed, and that this latter quickly disappeared before the splendour and variety of the new development. This is a great mistake. The most celebrated and popular of the cyclic poets were either contemporary with, or even subsequent to, the greatest iambic and elegiac poets, and the revival of epic poetry about the time of the Persian wars, and again at Alexandria, proves how deep and universal a hold it maintained upon the Greek mind. Nevertheless, after the opening of the seventh century B.C. it ceased to supply the spiritual wants of the Greeks of Asia Minor. No *original* successor of the poets of the Iliad and Odyssey had arisen, and the Greek public were not satisfied with the perpetual imitation of these old masterpieces. They were still less attracted by long mythical histories in epic verse, which pretended to be epic poems, but missed the tragic unity necessary to interest the hearer, and seemed rather designed to instruct the calm reader in mythical lore than to satisfy the

¹ We have at last a special history of Greek lyric poetry by Prof. H. Flach (Tübingen, 1882), a far better work than its very personal preface would lead us to expect. My principle, in this practical handbook, was to treat authors in proportion to their extant remains, and consequently I have been very brief about these lyric poets, whose genius only survives in stray fragments. But the elaborate discussions of Flach really contain little more than was already known; and, while correcting with his aid some inaccuracies, I am content to refer to him for all the subtleties of metric and of music, which no modern man can realise.

longings of the heart, or feed its emotions. While, therefore, epic poetry was making no advance, the social and political development of the Asiatic Greeks was growing with giant strides. Contact with the old Empires of the East gave them material culture, while traffic with barbarians brought them wealth to carry out their ideas. Perpetual conflicts, and fusions of classes, and adventures of war and of travel—in the *Odyssey* still the appanage of kings—brought out the feeling of personality, of self-importance in the poorer classes, and this feeling could not but find its expression in popular poetry.

We cannot sever the poets of this age according to their metres, for they almost all used various metres indifferently; nor even according to their dialect, for this often varied with the metre; nor does Melic poetry stand in any real contrast (as to matter) with elegiac and iambic. The division which I desire to follow is, first, subjective or personal poetry, including the early elegiac, iambic, trochaic, and such like verse, also those more strictly lyric poems which are called *Æolic*, and in which Alcæus or Sappho sang their personal joys and griefs; secondly, public or choral poetry—in this age always lyric, which consisted of those hymns to the gods, or processional odes, or songs of victory which were of public significance, yet into which the poet gradually introduced his personality. These public poems were not at first composed by special bards, but as schools and tendencies became fixed and developed, poets like Stesichorus and Pindar came to devote themselves almost exclusively to this side.

§ 114*. Since my last edition appeared, there has been a complete rehandling of the lyric poets, not from an æsthetic, or formal, but from a purely linguistic point of view. This theory is set forth by A. Fick in *Bezz. Beitr.* ix. 242, xiii. 176, and xiv. 258, and the substance of it is as follows. The reader has already seen (above, § 52*) what Fick's views are on the language of the extant epic poems, and that he thinks an earlier *Æolic* form of both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* must be assumed. When in this older form, they would naturally be more or less foreign to the poets of another Greek dialect, just as the poems of Burns are now foreign to English readers. The earlier group

of Ionic poets comprise Archilochus (who writes the dialect of the Cyclades), Callinus, Semonides, Mimnermus, Hipponax, Anacreon, Xenophanes, Phocylides, and, in some measure, Tyrtaeus. All these lived before the date of the Persian invasion of Ionia and the capture of Miletus. These early poets ought not, according to Fick, to be credited with non-Ionic forms, of which he accordingly proceeds to purge their texts.¹ Among the later poets, such as Theognis, and men of his age, there are, on the contrary, many distinctly Æolic forms, and these can be traced with certainty to the influence of the Homeric epic. Fick asserts that in the earlier poets (down to 540 B.C.) no such forms are found, unless it be that they have crept in by mistake, and can be easily removed. If anybody still holds the view that what we call Æolisms in Homer are really ancient Ionic speech, let him consider that in all our remains of really old Ionic poetry from Archilochus onward, these so-called archaic forms are completely absent. The later poets, on the other hand, have them in plenty. Whence comes this curious contrast? From the fact that the older poets only knew an Æolic Homer, which was not convenient for quotation, or perhaps even popular, whereas the later were provided with a Homer in Ionic garb, adapted for their use. They were naturally not critical as to some remaining Æolisms, and so the composite speech of Homer (in this condition) became the model for them and later poets. This striking combination assumes that the transcription of Homer did not take place till 540 B.C., or two centuries later than Fick had originally placed it. To me this change of date involves many difficulties; if the Æolic Homer had lasted till near 500 B.C. I think we should probably have clearer traces of it and clearer accounts of it. But as A. Fick has never yet left a subject he grasped in the place where he found it, but always carried it with him in his advance, the reader should have before him this newest speculation on the early poetry of Ionia.

§ 115. As I have already explained (p. 4), short lyrical effusions were never wanting among the Greeks, and irregular

¹ The reader may examine this interesting edition of the old Ionic personal poetry in *Bezz. Beitr.* xiii. 176, sq.; Solon, xiv. 259, sq.

or varying metres were already common among the people, when the long pompous hexameter was constructed by educated men, and raised to the universal form of higher literature. Short halting rhythms for fun and ridicule, bold anapæsts for war and for procession—these were no new inventions among the Greeks. Yet this in no way detracts from the capital merit of the great man who felt that epic poetry had exhausted its national history, and that he must seek among the people, and among the songs of the people, the inspiration for a renovation of poetry. The ancients are unanimous about the man, and fairly agreed as to his date, which they mark by the reign of Gyges, king of Lydia.¹ Later researches have brought the date of Gyges considerably below 700 B.C.,² so that while Hesiod was in the poor and backward parts of central Greece modifying, with timid hand, the tone and style of epic poetry, without abandoning its form, ARCHILOCHUS, storm-tost amid wealth and poverty, amid commerce and war, amid love and hate, ever in exile and yet everywhere at home—Archilochus broke altogether with the traditions of literature, and colonised new territories with his genius.

The remaining fragments show us that he used all kinds of

¹ It is, indeed, fixed by his frag. 25 (ed. Bergk, whose *Fragg. Poet. Lyr.* I quote throughout), quoted by a scholiast as the earliest use of the word. *τυραννίς* :—

οὐ μοι τὰ Γύγεω τοῦ πολυχρύσου μέλει,
οὐδ' εἰλέ πά με ζῆλος, οὐδ' ἀγαλομαι
θεῶν ἔργα, μεγάλης δ' οὐκ ἔρέω τυραννίδος
ἀπόπροθεν γάρ ἐστιν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμῶν.

Archilochus further mentions the devastation of Magnesia by the Kimmerians. The evidence is summed up by Susemihl in a learned note to his translation of Aristotle's *Politics* (vol. ii. p. 185).

² Cf. Gelzer's curious paper *Das Zeitalter des Gyges*, who fixes his reign at 687–53 B.C. by references to him in Assyrian inscriptions. According to Fick (*Odyssee*, p. 285) Arch. frag. 3 refers to the Lelantine war, which he also places about 660 B.C. But Fick puts Gyges too early. The researches of the astronomer Oppolzer (*Wien. Ber.* lxxxvi. pp. 790, sq.) show that the eclipse mentioned in frag. 74 agrees best with that of April 647 B.C., total at Thasos, where the poet spent his later years, though beginning in the forenoon, which seems not quite to agree with the poet's notion. These combined arguments make the later date pretty certain.

metre—elegiac, iambic, trochaic and irregular lyric.¹ He is often said to have invented iambic and elegiac verse. But we know that older poems, such as the *Margites*, contained iambs, and this verse seems associated from the beginning with the feasts of Demeter,² who was specially worshipped at Paros, where Archilochus was born. And no doubt all the other metres he used, though improved and perfected by his genius, were known among the people.

One of them, however, deserves special mention, because even the ancients felt an interest about its origin—the so-called *elegiac*. The word ἔλεγος (ἐλεγείον) can hardly be originally a Greek word, and seems of Phrygian derivation.³ It was applied in early times to a melody of plaintive character on the Phrygian flute, whether with or without a song is uncertain. The old shepherd's pipe (σύριγξ) seems to have been supplanted by this better instrument (αὐλός),⁴ made of reeds, which is alluded to in the marriage scene in *Iliad* Σ, and in the description of the Muses in the *Hymn to Hermes*. But the name elegy was gradually restricted to that peculiar modification of hexameters, by interposing the halting pentameter,⁵

¹ Cf. the account in Plut. *De Musica*, c. 28.

² This is described in the legend as the cheering of the sad goddess by the maid Iambe and her coarse wit. Cf. *Hymn to Demeter*, v. 199, sq.:—

οὐδέ τιν' οὔτ' ἔπει προσπτύσσετο οὔτε τι ἔργω
ἀλλ' ἀγέλαστος, ἄπαστος ἐδητύος ἡδὲ ποτήτος,
ῆστο, πόθω μινύθουσα βαθυζώνιο θυγατρὸς,
πρὶν γ' ὅτε δὴ χλεύης μιν Ἰάμβη κέδν' εἰδυῖα
πολλὰ παρασκώπτουσ' ἑτρέψατο πότνια, ἀγνήν,
μειδῆσαι γελάσαι τε καὶ ἴλαον σχεῖν θυμὸν·
ἢ δὴ οἱ καὶ ἔπειτα μεθύστερον εὔαδεν ὄργαϊς.

³ It is not older than the fifth century, ἔπη being at first applied even to elegiac verses. Cf. Theognis, v. 20. Cf. Flach, p. 159 *note*, who says it is Armenian, and means a song of mourning, with a flute. He assumes that Callinus must have written dirge-elegies, though no trace remains (p. 171).

⁴ Mr. Chappell has shown (*Hist. of Music*, i. p. 276) that it was probably constructed on the clarinet principle, with a vibrating tongue of reed inside the mouthpiece.

⁵ Always sung to the αὐλός, not recited. Cf. Rohde, *Griech. Roman*, p. 140 *note*.

which remained through the rest of Greek history a favourite mode of expression in personal poetry. We have all manner of subjects treated in this metre—morals, military and political exhortations, proverbial reflections, effusions of love and grief, epigrams of praise and epitaphs of sorrow—so much so that it is difficult to say what is its proper province. Perhaps there are three points, and three points only, which may be called permanent features in elegiac poetry. In the first place, it is *personal*, subjective as the Germans call it, and this feature comes out plainly enough even where the poet is discussing public topics, as in Solon's elegies, or narrating epic myths, as Antimachus in his *Lyde*. Even these were strictly personal poems. In the second place, it is almost always *secular*, religious poetry being either hexameter or strictly lyric in form. Thirdly, it is *Ionic*, and except in the case of epigrams or epitaphs, which are always of a local colour, is restricted to the dialect where it first arose.¹

We usually speak of the elegiac poets of Greece as if they were a distinct class, but there is hardly one of them at this epoch who did not use various metres, as appears even from the extant fragments. Thus Archilochus, so celebrated for his iambic satire, used the elegiac metre freely and with great elegance; Tyrtæus employed anapæsts, and Solon iambics. There is in fact hardly an early poet of whom we know much, except perhaps Mimnermus, who does not follow the example of Archilochus in the use of various metres. The previous use of elegiacs, of which the invention was attributed to Archilochus, may perhaps be established by the alleged quotations from CALLINUS, a poet of Ephesus about the fourteenth Olympiad (720 B.C.), who during the conflicts of Magnesia with his native town, and during the dreadful invasions of the Kimmerians, wrote warlike exhortations in elegiac metre, of

¹ There is a whole literature on the relation of epic to elegiac poetry, which may be found in Sittl, *L.G.* pp. 246-7. Reuner's tract *Über das Formelwesen der Elegie* (Leipzig, 1872) is the most interesting. The treatment of it as a *distich* seems not the original form, but came into fashion with the Alexandrians. Cf. Sittl, i. p. 248, and Croiset, vol. ii. chaps. 1 and 3; and below on Demodocus of Leros (p. 198, note), whose epigrams seem to disprove the remark.

which a considerable fragment has been preserved by Stobæus. There is, however, room to doubt whether this passage is not the work of Tyrtaeus, or some other early poet, and the shadowy figure of Callinus can hardly stand for us at the head of this department of Greek poetry, though Strabo distinctly asserts him to have been slightly anterior to Archilochus.

§ 116. This latter poet is plainly the leading figure in the new movement, and a strong and vigorous personality, who spoke freely and fearlessly of all his own failings and misfortunes.¹ He was born of a good family at Paros, but lived, owing to poverty, a life of roving adventure, partly, it appears, as a mercenary soldier,² partly as a colonist to Thasos; nor do his wanderings appear to have been confined to eastern Hellas, for he speaks in praise of the rich plains about the Siris in Italy (frag. 21). He was betrothed to Neobule, the youngest daughter of Lycambes, his townsman; but when she refused him, probably on account of his poverty, he vented his rage and disappointment in those famous satires, which first showed the full power of the iambic metre, and were the wonder and the delight of all antiquity. He ended his life by the death he doubtless desired, on the field of battle. In coarseness, terseness, and bitterness he may justly be called the Swift of Greek Literature. But even the scanty fragments of Archilochus show a range of feeling and a wideness of sympathy far beyond the complete works of Swift. He declares Mars and the Muse to be his enduring delights, but yet what can be more passionate than his love and his hate in all other human

¹ 'Critias (says Ælian, *Var. Hist.* x. 13) blames Archilochus for reviling himself extremely, for had he not (says he) circulated this character of himself through the Greek world, we should not have learned that he was the son of Enipo, a slave, or that, having left Paros on account of poverty and distress, he came to Thasos, and there quarrelled with the inhabitants; or that he reviled alike friends and enemies; nor should we have known in addition, but for his own words, that he was an adulterer, nor that he was licentious and insolent; and, worst of all, that he threw away his shield.'

² Mercenary soldiers, generally thought to belong to a later age, were common at that time, for the Greeks were always ready to sell their services to the rich Asiatic kings. Cf. Archil. fragg. 24, 58.

relations? He has noble passages of resignation too,¹ which sound like the voice of his later years, when his hardest task-master had lost his sway. But even these are as nothing compared to the real gush of feeling when he describes his youthful passions,² his love for Neobule, passing the Homeric love of women. Here he has anticipated Sappho and Alcæus, as in his warlike elegies he rivalled Tyrtaeus, in his gnomic and reflective wisdom Solon and Theognis, in his jibes Cratinus and Aristophanes, in his fables Æsop. His metaphors from beast-life are peculiarly various.

Of his Hymns to Heracles and Dionysus we are not able to form any opinion. Moreover these belong to the choral lyric poetry of the Greeks, which we separate and regard under a different head. But it is clear that his Hymn to Heracles and Iolaus, also called an Epinikion of Heracles, after his labours, was so popular that it was regularly sung at Olympia by a friendly chorus in honour of the victors on the day or evening of the victory. This the scholiasts on Pindar's ninth Olympian ode tell us, and the custom must have lasted till the later lyric poets Simonides and Pindar were paid to write special odes for these occasions. It is remarkable that in this hymn, of which the scholiasts just mentioned have preserved two or three lines, the leader sang the refrain (in the absence of an instrument), while the chorus sang the body of the hymn. Archilochus' poems, which were considered by competent critics

¹ Frag. 66: Θυμέ, θύμ' ἀμηχάνοισι κήδεσιν κυκώμενε,
[ἄνεχε] δυσμενῶν δ' ἀλέξει προσβαλὼν ἐναντίον
στέρνον, ἐνδοκοῖσιν ἐχθρῶν πλησίον κατασταθεὶς
ἀσφαλῆως • καὶ μήτε νικῶν ἀμφάδην ἀγάλλεο,
μήτε νικηθεὶς ἐν οἴκῳ καταπεσὼν ὀδύρεο •
ἀλλὰ χαρτοῖσιν τε χαῖρε καὶ κακοῖσιν ἀσχάλα
μὴ λίην • γίγνωσκε δ' οἷος ῥυσμὸς ἀνθρώπους ἔχει,

Cf. also fragg. 56, 74.

² Frag. 84: Δύστηνος ἔγκειμαι πόθῳ
ἄψυχος, χαλεπῇσι θεῶν ὀδύνησιν ἔκητ.
πεπαρμένος δι' ὀστέων.

And frag. 103: Τοῖος γὰρ φιλότῃτος ἔρως ὑπὸ καρδίῃν ἐλυσθεὶς
πολλὴν κατ' ἀχλὺν ὀμμάτων ἔχευεν
κλέψας ἐκ στηθέων ἀπαλὰς φρένας.

inferior to none in Greek Literature, except in their subjects, were preserved and known down to the Byzantine age, when their outspoken coarseness caused them to be left uncopied, and even deliberately destroyed by the monks.

§ 117. The next poet of this period is SIMONIDES,¹ or, as Chæroboscus insists, SEMONIDES, son of Krines, of Samos, who led a colony to the island of Amorgos, after which the poet is called, to distinguish him from the later Simonides of Keos. Here he dwelt in the town of Minoa. The chronologists place him about Ol. 29 or 30 (660 B.C.), and make him contemporary with, if not later than Archilochus. Though chiefly celebrated as one of the earliest iambic poets, he wrote the *Archæology of Samos*, in two books of elegiacs, of which no trace now remains. About forty fragments of his iambic verse are to be found in Bergk's collection, but only two of them are of any importance. One (25 lines) reflects on the restlessness and trouble of life, and recommends equanimity in a spirit of sad wisdom. The other (120 lines) is the famous satire on women, comparing them to sundry animals, owing to their having been created of these respective natures. Though sceptical critics have endeavoured to pull this fragment in pieces, and subdivide it into the work of various hands, we cannot but see in it the stamp of a peculiar mind, and a sufficient unity of purpose. The end only is feeble, and may possibly be by another hand, if feebleness be accepted as proof of spuriousness. The tone of the poem is severe and bitter, but with seriousness and strong moral convictions; the picture of the good woman at the close is drawn

¹ Bergk (*Fragg. Lyr.* pp. 515, 596, sq.) has shown considerable grounds for the existence of an early Euenus of Paros, who wrote erotic and sympotic elegies, of which fragments remain in the collection called by Theognis' name, and addressed to this Semonides as a contemporary. There was a later Euenus of Paros, with whom he may have been confused, and so forgotten. This is possible, but still so early an elegiast should have attracted sufficient notice to have escaped oblivion. I therefore hesitate to rehabilitate him, but think Bergk's arguments well worth indicating to the reader. This view is now supported by Flach, *G.L.* p. 424, who calls him 'a fiction of the grammarians.' The later Euenus is classed among the sophistical elegiasts, and seems to have lived in the latter half of the fifth century. There was also an erotic poet of the name in Hadrian's time.

with warmth and feeling, and shows that the poet did not undervalue the sex.¹

I have elsewhere² commented on the special features of the poem. The general idea recurs in the fragments of Phokylides. One of the latter fragments (16) is notable as implying the *ἑταίρα* of later days to have been fullblown in the seaports of Ionia, even in the seventh century B.C., nor do I know of any other early mention so explicit.³

There is another early Iambic poet, Aristoxenus of Selinus, cited by Hephæstion on no less authority than Epicharmus⁴; but he quotes from him only one anapæstic line:

τίς ἀλαζονείαν πλείσταν παρέχει τῶν ἀνθρώπων; τοὶ μάντιες,

and we wonder at such scepticism in Ol. 29, the date attributed to the poet by Eusebius. But we can say nothing more of him than to record the echo of his name.⁴

§ 118. We pass to a more famous and better preserved poet, TYRTÆUS, who does not hold a place among the 'Iambo-graphi,' as his remains are either elegiac, or anapæstic—the metre suited for military marches.

When the famous Leonidas was asked what he thought of Tyrtæus, he answered that he was *ἀγαθὸς νέων ψυχὰς αἰκάλλειν*—good for stimulating the soul of youth—and the extant frag-

¹ *τὴν δ' ἐκ μελίσσης· τὴν τις εὐτυχεῖ λαβὼν
κείνη γὰρ οἷα μῶμος οὐ προσίζανει·
θάλλει δ' ὑπ' αὐτῆς κἀπαέξεται βίος·
φίλη δὲ σὺν φιλεῦντι γηράσκει πόσει,
τεκοῦσα καλὸν κούνομάκλυτον γένος·
κἀριπρεπὴς μὲν ἐν γυναιξὶ γίγνεται
πάσῃσι, θεῖη δ' ἀμφιδέδρομεν χάρις
οὐδ' ἐν γυναιξὶ ἤδετα καθημένη,
ἴκου λέγουσιν ἀφροδισίους λόγους·
τοίας γυναικας ἀνδράσιν χαρίζεται
Ζεὺς τὰς ἀρίστας καὶ πολυφραδεστάτας.*

² *Social Greece*, 6th ed. p. 111.

³ Archilochus' frag. 19 is not so characteristic.

⁴ He is classed by O. Müller (ii. 55) as an actual forerunner of Epicharmus among the originators of comedy, which, if his date be truly ascertained, would be a grave anachronism. The tone and spirit of all the early iambic poets was of course akin to comedy, yet we can hardly confuse them with a school so distant and so unlike.

ments confirm this judgment. We have several long exhortations to valour (about 120 lines), with pictures of the advantages of this virtue, and the disgrace and loss attending on cowardice. There are also slight remains of his ἐμβατήρια, or anapæstic marches, which were sung by or for the Spartans when going to battle, with a flute accompaniment. His elegiac fragments differ little from those of Callinus, so little that many critics attribute the chief fragment of the latter to Tyrtæus. He is also said by Pollux to have composed songs for three choirs—one of old men, one of middle-aged, and one of youths, and this is curiously illustrated by a fragment of such a composition preserved in Plutarch,¹ where each line is sung by a chorus of different age.

There are also some remains of a poem cited as εὐνομία, which was distinctly political in character, and intended to excite in the public mind of the Spartans an attachment to their constitution, and especially to Theopompus, the Spartan hero of the second Messenian war. This leads us to the circumstances of Tyrtæus' life. He tells us himself that he was contemporary with the second Messenian war, which was carried on by the grandsons of the combatants in the first. We are told that the hardships of this war to the Spartans were very great. that a

¹ *Lycurgus*, 21 : Ἄμμες πόκ' ἤμες ἄλκιμοι νεανίαι.

Ἄμμες δὲ γ' εἰμές· αἱ δὲ λῆς, αὐγάσδεο.

Ἄμμες δὲ γ' ἐσσόμεσθα πολλῶ κάρρονες.

Bernhardy (ii. p. 604) thinks that the tripartite νόμος mentioned by Plutarch (*On Music*, p. 1134 A), which Sakadas composed, with the first verse Phrygian, the second Doric, the third Lydian in scale, may have been similarly intended to convey the temper of various ages of human life, but the actual combination of Dorian and Æolian modes by Pindar seems rather to weaken the conjecture. The fragments of Tyrtæus are mere extracts quoted by Lycurgus, or Stobæus, or other authors, and have, therefore, no separate MS. authority. So also there are no separate editions, as far as I know, except that of W. Cleaver (anon. 1761), with an English metrical translation and notes, and the new Italian version, also with a text and notes by Felix Cavalotti (Milan, 1878). The most convenient text is that of Bergk in his *Lyrici* (frag. 10 improved by a collation of a MS. at Oxford by Blass, *Jahrb.* 111, 597, sq.). The reader will find in his critical notes references to a number of special essays upon Tyrtæus by Osann.

large part of their territory adjoining Messene was left uncultivated; and Messenian elegies long preserved the tradition of the hero Aristomenes chasing his enemies across hill and dale. Under these trying circumstances chronic discontent, or what the Greeks called *σπάσις*, broke out, and the Spartans, by the direction of the Delphic oracle, came to seek from Athens an adviser. Later panegyrists of Athens added that the Athenians sent in derision the lame schoolmaster of Aphidnæ,¹ whose songs so inspirited the Spartans as to give them finally the victory. Herodotus (ix. 35) clearly did not know this story. Other allusions, however, speak of him as a Lacedæmonian, others as an Ionian.² How much of these legends is true it is very hard to say. That the Spartans—a race very susceptible of excitement through poetry and music, but not productive in these arts—should have been advised to borrow a famous poet of warlike elegies from some foreign city is in itself credible; it is equally so that the style, though produced in the home of Callinus and Archilochus, should have been already domesticated at Athens. The consistent tradition as to Tyrtæus' origin cannot be rejected by us, though he completely identifies himself in his poems with his adopted country, and writes as a Laconian.³

The story that he was summoned to Sparta on the authority of the Delphic oracle is told of a number of other remarkable poets about the same time, and shows, if true, that the priests

¹ There appears to have been a Laconian Aphidnæ (Steph. Byz.), but perhaps invented in later days to find a home for Tyrtæus.

² Flach positively asserts (from Suidas) that he came from Miletus (p. 183); but this is probably a mere blunder of Suidas (cf. Sittl, p. 252). Wilamowitz (*Herakles*, i. 69) sensibly suggests that the Laconian elegy—a distinct school—was fathered upon the name of a celebrated and poetical military leader, a sort of Spartan David.

³ It should be observed that he adheres to the traditional Ionic dialect in his elegiacs, but writes his marching songs in the Spartan:—

Ἄγετ', ὦ Σπάρτας εὐάνδρου
 κοῦροι πατέρων πολιατᾶν,
 λαιᾶ μὲν ἴτυν προβάλεσθε,
 δόρυ δ' εὐτόλμως βάλλετε
 μὴ φειδόμενοι τὰς ζωᾶς,
 οὐ γὰρ πάτριον τᾷ Σπάρτα.

of the shrine had in their minds the fixed policy of improving the culture and education of Sparta in the seventh century B.C. It is not unlikely that they (and the Spartan kings) foresaw the dangers arising from the one-sided Lyncurgian training, which was now in full force there, and sought to counteract them by stimulating a love of poetry and music. Thus a whole series of poets is reported to have been invited to Sparta at the behest of the Delphic oracle, and to have ordered and established not only the national songs of the Spartans, but public contests in music, poetry, and dancing.

§ 119. This brings us for the first time into contact with the true lyric poets of Greece, who, however, have been so constantly confounded with iambists and elegists (themselves also lyric poets) that it is necessary to call them by a technical name, and style them, as is always done in Germany, *Melic* poets. The distinctive feature of these poets, who were exceedingly numerous, but are exceedingly ill-preserved, and very various in character, was the necessary combination of music, and very frequently of rythmical movement, or *orchestic*, with their text. When this dancing came into use, as in the choral poetry of the early Dorian bards, and of the Attic dramatists, the metre of the words became so complex, and divided into subordinated rythmical periods, that Cicero tells us such poems appeared to him like prose, since the necessary music and figured dancing were indispensable to explain the metrical plan of the poet. I have no doubt many modern readers of Pindar will recognise the pertinence of this remark. It is therefore certain that the rise of melic poetry was intimately connected with the rise or development of music, and accordingly most historians of Greek literature devote a chapter in this place to that difficult subject. It is, however, so completely unintelligible to all but theorists in music, and there is even to them so much uncertainty about the facts, that I feel justified in passing it by with little more than a mere reference to the many special treatises on the subject.¹

¹ Cf. Westphal's *Musik des gr. Alterthums*, Leipzig, 1883; Fortlage's article in Ersch und Gruber's *Griechenland*; Mr. Wm. Chappell's *Hist. of*

§ 120. It may, however, be well to enumerate briefly the various technical terms for the many different kinds of melic poetry. The simple song of the Æolic school was sung by one person, and was never complicated in structure, as it was merely intended to reveal personal and private emotion: the choral melic poetry of the Greeks was, on the contrary, grand, elaborate, and public in its tone. It was devoted to state interests and public affairs; nor did the poet venture to obtrude himself except by passing allusions. In very old times, it seems that the *nome* (νόμος)¹ addressed to the gods was sung before the altar, with the lyre, by one singer; but this fashion early made way for choral performance, when it was called hymn (ὕμνος). Quite distinct was the *προσόδιον*, a processional song, accompanied by flutes, as the chorus marched to the temple. The *pæan* and *dithyramb* are hymns addressed to Apollo and Dionysus respectively. When the melic poem was accompanied with lively dancing it was called *hyporcheme* (ὑπόρχημα).² All these poems were performed by men and boys, but there were special compositions for a chorus of maidens, called *parthenia* (παρθενεία). These titles all indicate religious poetry, and no doubt this was the earliest field of melic verse; but although secular matters had many other forms (such as the elegy and the Æolic song) suited to them, even the forms of religious song were adapted to them on great public occasions, and so we have in Pindar's day *ἐγκώμια*, songs of praise; *ἐπινίκια*, songs of victory; and *θρήνοι*, laments for the dead—all secular applications of melic

Music, vol. i.; and the chapter on the intelligible results of much abstruse investigation in my *Social Life in Greece*. The reader may further consult the long chapter in Flach, which shows how little advance has been made. I am glad to see a high German authority taking my view of the matter, e.g. Sittl, *L.G.* i. p. 286.

¹ Cf. the note on νόμος, Flach, p. 285, and Liddell & Scott in new ed.; cf. our Cathedral use = *Weise*, and Alcman's (fr. 67) *δρν'χων νόμους*; also the texts on the Terpadrian *nome* of seven parts in Flach, p. 293.

² Perhaps, however, *προίμια* should have been added to the list (cf. above, § 96), and *σκολιά*, which Flach ascribes to Terpander, p. 207. As specimens of what a *pæan* was, we may take the first chorus in Sophocles' *Œd. Rex*; of hyporchemes, the ode to Pan in his *Philoctetes*, and the closing hymn in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*.

poetry. These technical details seem necessary to explain the constantly recurring terms, which the historian cannot avoid ; but as Wilamowitz justly says, they are only pedantic distinctions. The main fact is that the poet as an individual addresses the public in all of them, and that the chorus is merely his vehicle.

§ 121. As I have already mentioned, the poets of this early period, if we except the epic poets, were almost all composers in various metres, and, what is more important from the point of view of this work, they did not clearly separate their private feelings and public functions. The iambic metre, which in Archilochus was essentially personal and subjective, became, in the hands of the earlier Simonides and others, the vehicle for general sketches and for proverbial philosophy. The earlier elegy, which is essentially public and patriotic in character, down even to Solon's day, was, nevertheless, by Mimnermus brought back to its original scope—that of amorous complaint and tender grief, nor did subsequent ages and languages accept the tone of manly endurance and of political teaching as the natural voice of the elegy. When Tyrtaeus and Alcman were friends or rival bards together at Sparta, the melic hymns of the Lydian were not recognised as more essentially public than the warlike elegies of the Athenian. Thus even Theognis and Solon cloak their public advices under the form of personal exhortations to friends, or even to themselves, and Pindar carries on his private controversies under the cover of public hymns of victory and praise of the gods. But according as the various styles were developed, certain precedents began to make themselves felt. No severance, however, took place till after the rise of Doric choral poetry, when this division of melic poetry appropriated all the public affairs of men. On the other hand, the iambic, and more especially the elegiac, metres, which had been of universal application hitherto, began, with the Æolic songs, to affect a personal and private complexion. Hence, from this period onwards a division according to metres, though even now far from satisfactory, to some extent accords with that I have adopted above (p. 172). I purpose treating first the personal poetry in the later iambic

and elegiac poets, as well as in the Æolic melos, and then the public lyrists of the Doric type, including the sepulchral epitaphs, which were generally elegiac in form, but public in character.

§ 122. The student should carefully distinguish between *κιθαρωδική* and (*ψιλλή*) *κιθάρισις*, singing with a string accompaniment and mere harp playing, and similarly *αὐλωδική* and *αὐλητική*. Thus Olympus was a mere *αὐλητικός*, to be expunged from the list of lyric poets, and Clonas of Tegea seems to be the first *αὐλωδικός*, or composer of melic poetry with a flute accompaniment; and this innovation was supported by the similar advance of Terpander.¹

For this remarkable man, who stands at the head of the melic poets, is called the first *κιθαρωδός*, or composer of melic poems accompanied throughout by the lyre, in contrast, I suppose, to those epic recitations which began with an *ἀναβολή* or prelude on the instrument. If this be true, it puts him in competition with his great contemporary Archilochus, who is said to have first composed independent accompaniments (*ὑπὸ τὴν ψῆδην*), as previously the instrument had followed the voice note for note (*πρόσχωρδα κρούειν*).

We know nothing of Terpander's youth, save that he was born in Lesbos, the real home of melic poetry, and came, or was called, to Sparta, where he established the musical contests at the Carnean festival about 670 B.C. (Ol. 26).² He was said to have been the victor at the Pythian contests for four consecutive eight-year feasts, which brings down his activity at least to the year 640 B.C. Thus we may imagine him the older contemporary of Tyrtæus. Not twenty lines of his hymns remain—solemn fragments in hexameters or heavy spondaic metres, which show that hymns to the gods (*nomes*) were his chief pro-

¹ For a discussion of the *nomes* attributed to Clonas by Plutarch, cf. Flach, pp. 257–60. But he denies (p. 262) his very existence; also the elaborate discussion in the same author, p. 119, sq., who thinks that the melodies of Olympus led the way to Greek lyric poetry. But these speculations will ever remain uncertain.

² Hellanicus said that his name opened the list of Carnean victors. Sosibius makes this Ol. 26.

ductions.¹ It is evident that epic poetry was still predominant when he wrote, and affected his style. One interesting personal fragment is quoted by Strabo to prove that he increased the strings of the lyre from four to seven.² Strabo seems sure about the sense, though not about the genuineness of the lines. But in spite of his authority, supported by that of Mr. Chappell,³ and the curious statement of Plutarch,⁴ that he deliberately gave up the use of many strings, and won his prizes by playing on *three*, I think Bergk has hit the truth where he interprets the passage not of the strings of the lyre, which according to the *Hymn to Hermes* had been originally seven, but to the divisions of his odes, which having been four, were, according to Pollux, increased by him to seven.⁵

§ 123. The names of Clonas of Tegea, of Sakadas of Argos, of Polymnestus of Colophon,⁶ of Echembrotus of Arcadia, are mentioned as successors to Terpander in the art of combining music and poetry, but have no place now in the history of Greek literature, as all their works have long perished. The same is the case with the more celebrated Thaletas of Crete, summoned by the oracle (as Tyrtæus was) to heal pestilence and sedition, and attach the citizens more firmly to the Lycurean constitution. He is reported to have organised afresh

¹ Here is one: Ζεῦ πάντων ἀρχά, πάντων ἀγῆτωρ,
Ζεῦ, σοὶ σπένδω ταύταν ὕμνον ἀρχάν.

On the metre cf. Bergk, *FLG.* p. 813. The lines are best scanned as molossi with a catalectic syllable. Cf. the parody in Aristoph. *Nubes*, 275, sq.

² Σοὶ δ' ἡμεῖς τετράγηνυν ἀποστέρξαντες αἰοιδᾶν
ἐπτατόνῳ φόρμιγγι νέους κελαδήσομεν ὕμνους.

³ *Hist. of Music*, i. p. 30.

⁴ *De Mus.* 18.

⁵ Viz. ἐπαρχά, μεταρχά, κατατροπά, μετακατατροπά, δμφαλός, σφραγίς, ἐπίλογος. Regarding the first two as equivalent to προοίμιον and ἀρχά, the third and fourth (transition members on either side of the δμφαλός), and the ἐπίλογος, were evidently the newer members.

⁶ Pindar (fr. 188) cites an expression of Polymnestus as popularly known. On Sakadas, cf. above, p. 181, note, and Flach, p. 281, sq. These were the fathers of the Doric *Cultlyrik* as contrasted with the *Gefühlslyrik* of the Æolians; Flach, p. 276.

the *Gymnopaedia* in Ol. 28 (664 B.C.),¹ and to have composed, not only *nomes*, like Terpander, but *hyporchemes* and *pæans*, which were sung by a choir with rythmical movements. He is referred by Plutarch to the school of Olympus' *nomes*, played with the flute, and not to Terpander's. Sittl (*L.G.* p. 293) justly remarks that as the proper production of melic poetry required, not only the composing of a good poem, but the composing of proper music, and moreover the arranging and training of the dancing, as well as the singing of the chorus, such men as Thaletas or Pindar were much sought after and honoured by Greek states. We have no parallel now except Wagner, who held the same sort of position.

§ 124. The first essentially lyric poet that lives for us is ALCMAN (about 630–600 B.C.), who stands somewhat isolated at the head of the melic poets, and still belongs to that remarkable epoch of literary history when Sparta, during the seventh century, was gathering from all parts of Greece poets and musicians to educate her youth. Pausanias saw his tomb at Sparta, among those of celebrated and noble Spartans, and speaks of his odes as not deficient in sweetness, though composed in the unmusical Spartan dialect.² This is true, the fragments are of great merit; but if the dialect does not impair their beauty, it certainly makes them to us, as it did to the old grammarians, very obscure. We learn from Alcman that he boasted his origin to be from no obscure or remote land—enumerating many countries which perplexed even the old commentators—but from the lofty Sardis.³ It is to be presumed that he had, at

¹ Flach puts him about 700 B.C.; Hoeck and O. Müller, 640–580—I think, more probably. Cf. the list of obscure names mentioned as early successors of Terpander and of Thaletas in Flach, pp. 212–3 and 273, sqq.

² ᾧ ποιήσαντι ἄσματα οὐδὲν ἐς ἡδονὴν αὐτῶν ἐλυμήνατο τῶν Λακώνων ἢ γλῶσσα, ἥκιστα παρεχομένη τῷ εὐφωνον. It was, however, enriched with Epic and Æolic forms. Cf. Ahrens, in *Philolog.* xxvii. 619.

³ Frag. 25 :
οὐκ εἰς ἀνὴρ ἀγροίκος οὐδὲ
σκαίδς οὐδὲ παρὰ σοφοῖσιν
οὐδὲ Θεσσαλὸς γένος
οὐδ' Ἑρυσίχαῖος οὐδὲ ποιμήν,
ἀλλὰ Σαρδίῳ ἀπ' ἀκρᾶν.

And cf. frag. 118, quoted from Aristides, ii. 508 : Ἐτέρωθι τοίνυν καλλωπιζόμενος παρ' ὅσοις εὐδοκιμῇ, τῶσαυτα καὶ τοιαῦτα ξθνη καταλέγει ὥστ' ἔτι νῦν τοὺς ἀθλίους γραμματιστὰς ζητεῖν, οὗ γῆς ταῦτ' εἶναι.

least, an Ionian mother (if he was not brought as a slave to Greece in early youth); for no pure Lydian could have written as he did, not even in the Ionic dialect, but in that of his adopted country. But the whole history of the man, and the main features of his fragments, show us how completely the Sparta of the seventh century differed from the Sparta of the fifth, and how utterly the Spartan gentleman who warred against Messene would have despised the ignorant professional warrior who afterwards contended against Athens. The very adoption of a Lydian at Sparta (Suidas says a Lydian slave), and his proud enumeration of geographical names, imply a spirit the very reverse of the later exclusiveness (*ξενηλασία*). So also the love of eating and drinking which the poet confesses of himself, his account of the various wines produced in the districts of Laconia, his open allusions to his passion for Megalostrata, and the loose character of his erotic poems generally,¹ are quite foreign to the ordinary notions of Lycurgean discipline. I suppose that the royal power, which endeavoured to assert itself in early times, and was only reduced to subjection by the murder of Polydorus, the submission of Theopompus, and the gradual strengthening of the power of the ephors, attempted to carry out a literary policy like that of the Greek despots. In the seventh century, before the struggle was finally decided against them, the kings, aided by the Delphic oracle, sought to emancipate the subject races from political, the dominant from educational, slavery; and so it came that poets like Alcman, who sing of wine and love, who delight in feasting and eschew war, could be tolerated and even popular at Sparta. But the first of the melic appears also the last of the Spartan poets.

¹ Athenæus cites (through Chamæleon) Archytas to the effect that Alcman *γεγονέναι τῶν ἐρωτικῶν μελῶν ἡγεμόνα, καὶ ἐκδοῦναι πρῶτον μέλος ἀκόλαστον ὄντα κ.τ.λ.*, and then quotes frag. 36. Of course Alcman had before him the example of his earlier contemporary Archilochus. The fragg. 35-9 are unfortunately inadequate specimens of this side of his genius. Flach (p. 302), who does not feel the difference of this earlier Sparta, tries to account for Alcman's freedom and rollicking by his Lydian extraction, as if that would have made it tolerable to a really strict modern Spartan! Wilamowitz, who does, calls Alcman the poet of the Perioeci, as contrasted with Tyrtaeus, the poet of the Dorian nobility (*Herakles*, i. 71).

His six books contained all kinds of *melos*, hymns, pæans, prosodia, parthenia, and erotic songs. His metres are easy and various, and not like the complicated systems of later lyrists. On the other hand, his proverbial wisdom, and the form of his personal allusions, sometimes remind one of Pindar. But the general character of the poet is that of an easy, simple, pleasure-loving man. He boasts that he imitated the song of birds (fr. 17, 67)—in other words, that he was a self-taught and original poet. Nevertheless, he shows, as might be expected, a knowledge and appreciation of Homer. Several fragments express a peculiar love and study of nature, somewhat exceptional for a Greek lyrist. Of these, the most remarkable is his description of night,¹ which is more like the picture we should expect from Apollonius Rhodius or Virgil than from an early Greek poet. Another is evidently written in advancing age, and with a presentiment of approaching death.²

- ¹ Frag. 60: εὔδουσιν δ' ὀρέων κορυφαί τε καὶ φάραγγες,
 πρώονές τε καὶ χαράδραι,
 φύλλα θ' ἔρπετά θ' ὅσσα τρέφει μέλαινα γαῖα,
 θῆρες ὀρεσκῶοι τε καὶ γένος μελισσᾶν
 καὶ κνώδαλ' ἐν βένθεσι πορφυρέας ἄλός·
 εὔδουσιν δ' οἰωνῶν
 φύλα ταυνπτερύγων.

'A beautiful peculiarity,' says Mure (*Hist. Gr. Lit.* iii. 206), 'of this description is the vivid manner in which it shadows forth the scenery of the vale of Lacedæmon, with which the inspirations of the poet were so intimately associated; from the snow-capped peaks of Taygetus down to the dark blue sea which washes the base of the mountain. The author would find it difficult to convey to the imagination of the reader the effect produced upon his own by the recurrence of the passage to his mind, during a walk among the ruins of Sparta, on a calm spring night, about an hour after a brilliant sunset.'

- ² Frag. 26: οὐ μ' ἔτι, παρθενικὰ μελιγάρνεις ἡμερόφωνοι,
 γυῖα φέρειν δύναται· βάλε δὴ βάλε κηρύλος εἴην,
 ὅς τ' ἐπὶ κύματος ἄνθος ἄμ' ἀλκυνέσσι ποτῆται
 νηλεγὲς ἦτορ ἔχων, ἀλιπόρφυρος εἶαρος ὄρνις.

The term κηρύλος was used for the male halcyon. On βάλε, the marginal note says the full word is ἀβάλε, σημαντικὸν εὐχῆς, and equal to ὀφελεν, εἶθε, εἴθε. The frequent Æolisms of Alcman have given rise to much discussion. So far as they were Epic there seems no difficulty; hence it may be inferred that the text of Homer which he knew was far more

But by far the longest and most interesting relic of Alcman was found in 1855, by M. Mariette, in a tomb near the second Pyramid—a papyrus fragment of three pages, containing a portion of his celebrated hymn (*parthenion*) to the Dioscuri. Two of the pages are wretchedly mutilated, and the sense of the whole composition is very obscure and difficult. This extraordinary discovery was not so precious in actual results as in the hope it gave us of rescuing in the same way other portions of the old Greek poets from their oblivion. It also gives us a very early specimen of Greek writing, and one of great value for the history of palæography. I append the more intelligible part in a note below.¹ Wilamowitz, in the brilliant sketch of early Greek Æolic than ours are. Cf. Sittl, *L.G.* p. 300. The Alexandrians—Aristarchus, &c., wrote about his dialect as Spartan.

¹ Its restoration has been attempted (since its first publication by Egger in his *Mémoires d'histoire ancienne*) by Ten Brink and Bergk, with some success; by F. Blass in *Hermes*, vol. xiii. p. 27 (cf. now Bergk, *FLG.* 4th ed. iii. p. 30), from whose text I quote, as it differs considerably from earlier restorations. After celebrating the victory of the Dioscuri over the Hippocoontidæ, the poet proceeds to sing the praises of Agido and Agesichora. It seems partly sung by soloists, partly by chorus.

COL. II.

Στρ. δ'.

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|----|
| 2 | Ἔστι τις σιῶν τίσις· | 36 |
| | ὑδ' ὕλβιος, ὅστις εὐφρων | |
| | ἁμέραν διαπλέκει | |
| 5 | ἄκλαυστος. ἐγὼν δ' αἰείδω | |
| | Ἄγιδῶς τὸ φῶς· ὄρῳ | 40 |
| | ῥ' ᾗτ' ἄλιον, ὅνπερ ἄμιν | |
| | Ἄγιδῶ μαρτύρεται | |
| | φαίνεν. ἐμὲ δ' οὐτ' ἐπαινὲν | |
| 10 | οὔτε μωμέσθαι νιν ἅ κλενὰ χοραγὸς | |
| | οὐδαμῶς ἐη· δοκέει γὰρ ἤμεν αὐτα | 45 |
| | ἐκπρεπῆς τῷς ᾗπερ αἱ τις | |
| | ἐν βοτοῖς στάσειεν ἵππον | |
| | παγὸν ἀεθλοφόρον καναχάποδα, | |
| 15 | τῶν ὑποπετριδίων ὀνείρων. | |
| | Στρ. ε'. | |
| | Ἡ οὐχ ὀρῆς; ὃ μὲν κέλης | 50 |
| | Ἐνετικός· ἅ δὲ χαίτα | |
| | τᾶς ἐμᾶς ἀνεψιάς | |
| | Ἀγησιχόρας ἐπανθεῖ | |
| 20 | χρυσὸς ᾗτ' ἀκήρατος, | |

literature which introduces his theory of the Attic drama (*Herakles*, i. 71), notes that two things are clear about Alcman : (1) the mixture of Æolic, Epic and Laconian features in his poetry, (2) his combination of a choral lyric form with the individual expression of the poet's feelings. From this point of

	τό τ' ἀργύριον πρόσωπον.	55
	διαφάδαν τί τοι λέγω ;	
	Αγησιχόρα μὲν αὐτὰ	
	ἄδε δευτέρᾳ πεδ' Ἀγιδῶν τὸ εἶδος	
25	ἵππος εἰβήνῃ κόλαξ ἅες δραμεῖται.	
	ταὶ Πελειάδες γὰρ ἄμιν	60
	Ὀρθίᾳ φάρος φεροίσαις	
	νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίαν ἀγεσθήριον	
	ἄστρον αὐειρομέναι μάχονται.	
	Στρ. ε'.	
30	Οὔτε γὰρ τι πορφύρας	
	τόσσος κόρος ὥστ' ἄμυναι,	65
	οὔτε ποικίλος δράκων	
	παγχρύσιος, οὐδὲ μήτρα	
	Λυδία, νεανίδων	
COL. III.	τὰν οἶδα φαρῶν ἄγαλμα,	
	οὐδὲ ταὶ Ναρνῶς κόμαι,	70
	ἀλλ' οὐδ' Ἐράτα σιειδής,	
	οὐδὲ Συλακίς τε καὶ Κλησισίηρα,	
5	οὐδ' ἐς Αἰνησιμβρότας ἐνθόισα φασεῖς	
	Ἄσταφίς τέ μοι γένοιτο,	
	καὶ ποτιβλέποι Φίλυλλα,	75
	Δαμαίπα τ' ἔρατά τε Ἴανθεμίς,	
	ἀλλ' Ἀγησιχόρα με τηρεῖ	
	Στρ. ζ'.	
10	Οὐ γὰρ ἂ καλλίσφυρος	
	Ἀγησιχόρα πάρ' αὐτεῖ ;	
	Ἀγιδοὶ μέσφ' ἄρ' μένει,	80
	θωστήρια κἄμ' ἐπαινεῖ.	
	ἀλλὰ τᾶν[δ' ἄμ]ῶν, σιοί,	
15	δέξασθ' ἂπονητὶ ἄνα	
	καὶ τέλος· γραῖς τό τις	
	εἴποιμί κ' ἂπαν μὲν αὐτὰ	85
	παρσένος μάταν ἀπὸ θράνῳ λέλακα	
	γλαυξ. ἐγὼν δὲ τᾷ μὲν Ἀώτι μάλιστα	
20	ἀνδάνην ἐρῶ· πόνων γὰρ	
	ἄμιν ἰάτωρ ἔγεντο·	
	ἐξ Ἀγησιχόρας δὲ νεάνιδες	90
	ἦ ῥ' αἶνας ἐρατᾶς ἐπέβαν.	

view he makes an important onward step in the development of Greek melic.

§ 125. Returning to the elegy, or personal poetry of the epoch, we come to a very distinctive and remarkable man, MIMNERMUS (called Liguastades, for his sweetness), the first composer of purely private and sentimental, as opposed to political, elegies. There are, indeed, in his fragments historical allusions, and he describes (fr. 14) with much fire, and in a spirit not unworthy of Tyrtaeus, the valour of a hero 'who scattered the dense phalanxes of the Lydian horsemen through the plain of Hermus.' This he had heard from the elders who remembered the wars with Gyges, for the date of Mimnermus is given as Ol. 37, or the close of the seventh century, and he was an early contemporary of Solon. But his other fragments are those of the greatest interest, and are chiefly from his book or books, called *Nanno*, after a flute player whom he loved without success. He is himself called an αἰλφδός, or singer with a flute accompaniment, and he probably revived the old plaintive elegy of the Phrygians, in close sympathy with the sorrowful laments of his sweet and tender muse. To the later Alexandrians, and the Romans, whose reflective age peculiarly appreciated the sad world-weariness of this bard of Colophon, the *Nanno* elegies of Mimnermus were a favourite model, and we may perhaps assign to him the position and title of the Petrarch of Greek literature.

It is remarkable that the contemporaries and immediate successors of Mimnermus were of a different opinion. The poets who desired to sing of love and passion did not adopt his elegiac metre as their fittest vehicle. It still remained the metre of political and philosophical expression, of wise advice, of proverb and of epigram. To early Greek love, to the passion of Alcæus, Sappho, and Anacreon, no form could be more unutterably slow and cold than the deliberate hexameter. When bookworms at Alexandria and Roman dilettanti began to talk about love, it suited them well enough, and it was the subdued and resigned attitude of Mimnermus, his modernism, if I may so say, which made him to them, and to many of the moderns, so sweet and perfect a singer of love.

I do not think the famous fragment (12) on the perpetual labours of Helios so striking or characteristic as those which sing of the delights of love, and the miseries of old age ¹—*γῆρας ἀργαλέον*, as he calls it, applying an epithet which he used with curious consistency of all manner of disagreeable necessities. In his hatred of old age, he struck a note which found response in many Greek hearts at all times, and Sophocles and Euripides repeat without improving the burden of his elegies.

Almost all the fragments (some 90 lines) express the same gloom and the same despair. We owe the preservation of most of them to Stobæus; Strabo has cited a few of geographical importance; Athenæus that on the sun's course. His ninth fragment tells how 'we left the lofty Neleïon of Pylos, and came in ships to the lovely Asia, and into fair Colophon we settled with might of arms, being leaders of wild daring, and starting from thence by the counsel of the gods we took the Æolic Smyrna.' This is a very early and clear piece of evidence for what is called the Ionic migration, which has been doubted, or relegated to the region of myths by some sceptical historians.

§ 126. Mimnermus leads us over naturally to SOLON, who addressed him in a still extant fragment, in reply to his lines:—

αἶ γὰρ ἄτερ νοῦσων τε καὶ ἀργαλέων μελεδωνῶν
ἐξηκονταέτη μοῖρα κίχοι θανάτου.

¹ ἡμεῖς δ' οἶά τε φύλλα φύει πολυανθέος ὥρη
ἔαρος, ὅτ' αἴψ' ἀνγῆς αἷζεται ἡελίου,
τοῖς ἵκελοι πῆχυν ἐπὶ χρόνον ἀνθεσιν ἥβης
τερπόμεθα, πρὸς θεῶν εἰδότες οὔτε κακὸν
οὔτ' ἀγαθόν· κῆρες δὲ παρεστήκασι μέλαιναι,
ἡ μὲν ἔχουσα τέλος γήραος ἀργαλέου,
ἡ δ' ἑτέρη θανάτοιο· μίνυνθα δὲ γίγνεται ἥβης
καρπός, ὅσον δ' ἐπὶ γῆν κίδναται ἥελιος·
αὐτὰρ ἐπὶν δὴ τοῦτο τέλος παραμείψεται ὥρης,
αὐτίκα τεθνάμεναι βέλτιον ἢ βίος·
πολλὰ γὰρ ἐν θυμῷ κακὰ γίγνεται· ἄλλοτε οἶκος
τρυχοῦται, πενίης δ' ἔργ' ὀδυνηρὰ πέλει·
ἄλλος δ' αὖ παίδων ἐπιδύεται, ὧντε μάλιστα
μείρων κατὰ γῆς ἔρχεται εἰς Ἀἴδην·
ἄλλος νοῦσον ἔχει θυμοφθόρον· αὐδὲ τις ἔστιν
ἀνθρώπων, ᾧ Ζεὺς μὴ κακὰ πολλὰ δίδοι.

Solon's answer was as follows :—

ἀλλ' εἴ μοι κἄν νῦν ἔτι πείσεται, ἔξελε τοῦτο,
μηδὲ μέγαιρ' ὅτι σεῦ λῶον ἐπεφρασάμην,
καὶ μεταποίησον, Λιγυσσάδῃ, ὧδε δ' ἔειδε.
Ὀγδωκονταέτη μοῖρα κίχιοι θανάτου.

It appears, then, that these elegies were well known, and the poet yet alive, when Solon was a literary man. The events of Solon's great life (639–559 B.C.) form an important chapter in Greek history, and can be found there by the student.¹ We are here only concerned with his literary side. He is remarkable in having written poetry, not as a profession, nor as his main occupation, but as a relaxation from graver cares. He was first a merchant, then a general, then a lawgiver, and, at last, a philosophic traveller; and all these conditions of life, except the first, are reflected in his extant fragments. As usual with the personal poets of that epoch, he employed various metres, of which the elegiac was the chief, but the trochaic and iambic also prominent, and not for satire and invective, but for political and philosophic reflections. Some lines, apparently from early compositions, are cited to show his high appreciation of sensual pleasures, and there are features in his laws which prove that he made large allowance for this side of human nature in his philosophy. Amid the various feelings which appear in his personal confessions we miss the poetical despondency of Mimnermus, and that peculiar beauty and sweetness of expression, which made the latter an unapproachable master of the elegy in our modern sense. Solon is a practical man, at times a philosopher who speculates on Providence and the life of man; again, a noble martyr for his country, who feels beset by foes and jealous rivals, and complains bitterly that he stands alone and unfriended in the state which he has saved. But he is always manly, and, perhaps, somewhat hard and plain in his language, choosing poetry as the only known vehicle of expression in his day, but saying in verse what in after days would have been said in prose. Hence it is that the later orators found him so suitable for quotation. His political

¹ On the sources of his life in Diog. L. and Plutarch. cf. Volquardsen in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, vii. 389, sq.

recollections, and his advices to his friends, were in Athens handbooks of political education.

There remain but eight lines of his famous elegy called *Salamis*, whereby he incited his people to persevere in wresting this island, the place of his birth, from Megara. Of his *Meditations* (*ὑποθήκαι εἰς Ἀθηναίους* and *εἰς ἑαυτὸν*) several long passages are quoted, one by Demosthenes,¹ to which the student can easily refer; several by Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius in their lives of Solon, another by Stobæus. The last, a passage of seventy lines, is of great interest as containing a summary of Solon's philosophy concerning human life, but can hardly be fairly conveyed by quoting short extracts. Many other snatches of proverbial wisdom, or gnomes, are cited from these *ὑποθήκαι*, and are among the sententious fragments which have made historians speak of the *Gnomic poets* of Greece as a distinct class.² This was never the case, though there can be no doubt that the personal poets from this time onward adopted a philosophical tone which made them peculiarly fit for educational purposes. Many of his poems bore on their titles personal dedications, *πρὸς Κριτίαν*, *πρὸς Φιλόκυπρον*, *πρὸς Φῶκον*, thus preserving the personal character of the elegy, while treating public topics. The last cited was in tetrameters, and told of the temptations and solicitations to which the great lawgiver had been exposed.³ He also composed melic poems

¹ In his *Περὶ πρεσβείας*, p. 254. A few more lines are now recovered in the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* of Aristotle.

² e.g. πολλοὶ γὰρ πλουτεῦσι κακοί, ἀγαθοὶ δὲ πένονται,
ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς αὐτοῖς οὐ διαμειψόμεθα
τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸν πλοῦτον, ἐπεὶ τὸ μὲν ἔμπεδον αἰεὶ,
χρήματα δ' ἀνθρώπων ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει.

And Πάντῃ δ' ἀθανάτων ἀφανῆς νόος ἀνθρώποισιν,
a text admirably developed in his frag. 13, of *meditations* (*ὑποθήκαι εἰς ἑαυτὸν*).

³ He was thought a fool by his friends not to seize and hold the tyranny of Athens when he had the power, for in their opinion it was worth being flayed alive to have once enjoyed such a position. Euripides gives an admirable expression of this Greek passion for holding a tyranny in the speech of Eteocles in his *Phanissæ*, vv. 500, sq.—the solitary passage which may have come from Euripides through George Gascoigne into Shakespeare, as will be shown in a subsequent chapter.

for musical recitation at banquets. All these varied scraps, full of precious historical information, do not now amount to more than 250 lines.¹ I will quote the elegy on the nine ages of man (though doubted by Porson), because it seems preserved entire in a somewhat inaccessible treatise of Philo, and because it develops an idea often since repeated in philosophical poetry. This poem is, indeed, constantly referred to by ancient authorities.²

It is often maintained that Solon is the one great politician who holds a place in Greek literature, but this is only true for us, and would never have been asserted had the works of his contemporaries reached us. It seems, on the contrary, to have been the fashion at this period for every important political man to teach his fellow-citizens in elegies, and to write convivial songs, as we may see from the notices of Diogenes about Pittacus, and Periander, and Bias.³ Hence the reputation of

¹ His remains are printed by Fick (*Bezz. Beit.* xiv. 259, sq.) with a special attention to the Old-Attic dialect, which Solon probably represents better than any other extant source. We have now a fragment on marble giving the ordinances for the first cleruchs to Salamis (circ. 560-70 B.C.), but very mutilated. Cf. *Bull. de corresp. hel.* xii. 1, sq.

² παῖς μὲν ἀνηβος ἔων ἔτι νήπιος ἔρκος ὁδόντων
 φύσαις ἐκβάλλει πρῶτον ἐν ἔπτ' ἔτεσιν·
 τοὺς δ' ἑτέρους ὅτε δὴ τελέσῃ θεὸς ἔπτ' ἐνιαυτούς,
 ἥβης ἐκφαίνει σήματα γεινομένης·
 τῇ τριτᾷ δὲ γένειον ἀεζομένων ἔτι γυίων
 λαχνούται, χροίῃς ἄνθος ἀμειβομένης
 τῇ δὲ τετάρτῃ πᾶς τις ἐν ἑβδομάδι μέγ' ἄριστος
 ἰσχύν, ἦντ' ἄνδρες σήματ' ἔχουσ' ἀρετῆς·
 πέμπτῃ δ' ὠρίου ἄνδρα γάμον μεμνημένον εἶναι
 καὶ παίδων ζητεῖν εἰσοπίσω γενεήν·
 τῇ δ' ἕκτῃ περὶ πάντα καταρτύεται νόος ἀνδρός,
 οὐδ' ἔρδειν ἔθ' ὁμῶς ἔργ' ἀπάλαμνα θέλει·
 ἑπτὰ δὲ νοῦν καὶ γλῶσσαν ἐν ἑβδομάσιν μέγ' ἄριστος
 ὀκτώ τ' ἀμφοτέρων τέσσαρα καὶ δέκ' ἔτη·
 τῇ δ' ἐνάτῃ ἔτι μὲν δύναται, μαλακώτερα δ' αὐτοῦ
 πρὸς μεγάλην ἀρετὴν γλῶσσά τε καὶ σοφίη·
 τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' ὅτε δὴ τελέσῃ θεὸς ἔπτ' ἐνιαυτούς,
 οὐκ ἂν ἄωρος ἔων μοῖραν ἔχοι θανάτου.

³ By comparing Herodotus, i. 170, concerning Bias' political advice to the Ionians, with the verbally similar statement of Diogenes Laertius, i. 5,

the so-called *Wise Men*, who, according to all the different lists of them, agree in combining poetical teaching with practical politics. Thus the wild confessions of Archilochus, which were followed up in Lesbos by no less passionate effusions, led the way to confessions of far different men, and to the development of the didactic side of elegiac and iambic poetry. The elegy assumes from this time onward this special character, and, if we accept its public side, as epigram, and a few imitations of the older social tone, appears confined within limits unknown in the seventh century.

§ 127. Contemporary with the serious and philosophical poetry of Solon, we have that remarkable burst of genius in the island of Lesbos, which, though it lasted but a generation,² has affected the lyrics of the world more than all the rest of Greek poetry. This school, though strictly melic, and always accompanied by music, differs fundamentally from the Doric melos, in being personal, secular, and composed in a different and local dialect, the Æolic. I therefore prefer classing it with the personal poetry of the Greeks, and separating it from the public choral poetry, with which other historians have combined it. At the head of this famous Æolic poetry stand Alcæus and Sappho, contemporaries, and both of Lesbos, flourishing from the 42nd Olympiad onward.³

We know of ALCÆUS that he was an aristocrat of Mytilene, that he fought against the Athenians for the possession of Sigeuni, but fled, and threw away his shield, which was hung up by his adversaries as a trophy. He was ever busy in the conflicts of the aristocrats against the rising power of the people,

ἐποίησε δὲ περὶ Ἰωνίας, τίνα μάλιστα ἀν τρόπον εὐδαιμονοίη, εἰς ἔπη δισχίλια,
I am persuaded that in Theognis, vv. 757–68, we have an actual fragment of Bias preserved, describing the blessing of the proposed Ionian settlement in Sardinia. Of the same date is Demodocus of Leros, whose distichs (Bergk, p. 65) tempt critics to call him the earliest epigrammatist. Cf. § 143.

² We can trace no connection with the poetry of Terpander, who lived two generations earlier.

³ According to Rohde: 640 (?), birth of Alcæus; 620, Melanchros king; 612, Melanchros killed; 610, Myrsilus killed; 608 (?), Sigeian war; 606, Pittacus strategus; 595, exile of nobles; 590, arbitration of Periander, Pittakus Æsymnet; 580, Alcæus recalled; 570, death of Pittacus.

and against the tyrant who professed to represent them. About Ol. 45 he assisted, along with his brother Antimenidas, and with Pittacus, in the overthrow of the tyrant Melanchros; but when, after much trouble and the death of another tyrant, Myrsilus, the great body of the citizens chose Pittacus as their dictator (a power which he held 589-79 B.C., and then resigned), Alcæus and his party were exiled, and lived a roving and adventurous life. Alcæus went as far as Egypt; Antimenidas as a mercenary to fight under Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and distinguished himself by slaying an opposing Goliath. At some time during Pittacus' rule Alcæus' party attempted a forcible return, when Alcæus was taken prisoner, but at once liberated by the man whom he had reviled with the greatest bitterness and fury in his poetry. These few facts, and his cruel spite against the tyrants and the noble Pittacus, show us in Alcæus the perfect picture of an unprincipled, violent, lawless Greek aristocrat, who sacrificed all and everything to the demands of pleasure and power. These are the men, and this the type of aristocrat, which gave the tyrants all their opportunities.

§ 128. Of SAPPHO (in her own dialect *Ψάπφα*¹) we know that she was the daughter of Skamandronymus (or Skamon) and of Kleïs. She was small and dark, but, notwithstanding these defects, often called beautiful. The official position of brother Zarichus, who was public cupbearer, and the adventures of her brother Charaxus, who was in the wine trade with Naucratis, and spent his substance on the fair Rhodopis, would imply that she, too, was of rich and aristocratic birth. She is said to have had a daughter Kleïs, and to have stood in friendly relations to Alcæus. She gathered about her a society of various maidens, who were inspired by her example to cultivate music and poetry. Of these the most celebrated was Erinna, whose poem called *Ἡλακᾶτη* (*the Spindle*) was quoted and admired. But both date and work of this poetess are very doubtful.²

There is no hint of political writing in the remains of Sappho. She seems to have devoted all her genius to the subject of love, and was decidedly the greatest erotic poet of

¹ If not *Ψάπφα*, as Mr. E. Gardner suggests on the evidence of the very early Naucratis inscriptions, which double the aspirates consistently. Cf. his chapter in *Naucratis*, part ii.

² On her date cf. Sittl, i. p. 332.

antiquity. The exceeding passion in her extant fragments, and the constant travesties of her in the middle and new comedy, to which her position as a literary woman made her peculiarly exposed, have produced a general impression against her moral character. She sang of her unrequited love for Phaon, and a legend came to be believed that she had in despair cast herself from the Leucadian rock, at the remote end of the Greek world. She is further accused of having felt an unnaturally violent passion for her girl friends, and her poetry has been called licentious and immoral. There has been a warm controversy between Welcker, on the one hand, who with over-chivalry has vindicated the honour and purity of Sappho, and Mure, on the other, who has turned aside from his path¹ to undertake the unpleasant task of proving that her passion was no mere enthusiasm, and that she was no better than she ought to be. Without entering upon this unsavoury discussion, I venture to suggest that both advocates are wrong in assuming that their own view excludes that of the other. If I understand the aristocratic society of these times rightly, what we call purity and virtue, and what we call unchastity and vice, were as yet to a great extent fused in that larger and more human naturalism, which embraces impulses of both kinds in their turn, and which refuses to consider momentary passion a permanent stain upon honour or even purity. The highest virtue of the Greek aristocrats did not exclude all manner of physical enjoyment.²

¹ *Hist. of Greek Lit.* iii. pp. 315, 496, sq. Cf. now K. Riedel, *Stand der S. Frage*, Waidhofen, Progr. 1881; Pöstion, *Griech. Dichterinnen*, Wien, 1882; and Rohde in *Rh. Mus.* xxxiii. 214, sq.; also Theodor Kock's *Alkaios u. Sappho*, an excellent monograph. Flach (*Gr. Lyrik*, p. 504) points out that the Greek comedy is silent on this charge against Sappho, and that Lucian is the first to use λεσβίζειν in this sense.

² M. E. Burnouf (*Lit. grecque*, i. p. 194) points out with great good sense that most literary historians have falsely imagined the society and habits of the Æolians at Lesbos to have been exceptionally free and even loose. They probably differed in no social or moral respect from their Ionic neighbours in Samos, Teos, and elsewhere. Both contrasted with the notions developed in course of time at both Sparta and Athens. 'À l'époque de Sappho et d'Alcée, les cités éoliennes et ioniennes avaient encore ces mœurs aristocratiques qui les font ressembler, à beaucoup d'égards, à la république de

§ 129. Having thus summarised our scanty information concerning the lives of these great artists, we may approach at more leisure the more important question of their position and services in the development of Greek literature. The first point to be settled is their filiation, if any, or their utter independence from previous art, and their recurrence to the pure source of popular song. It seems to me that the direct heredity of Alcæus, at all events, from Archilochus has been very much overlooked.¹ No two poets in Greek literature are so like in temper. Not to speak of distinct copying, such as the confession of throwing away his shield in Alcæus, we can see in the abuse of Pittacus a political counterpart to the attacks on Lycambes, we can see the same employment of very various metres, the same enjoyment of love and wine, of rambling about the world, and of adventure. Neither poet uses the unvarnished dialect of his native town, but from experience of travel, and probably from purely artistic reasons, both write a literary form of their national speech. Sappho herself refers to Terpander, as if her model. So far as the love poems of Archilochus are extant, they seem also the distinct forerunners of the poetry of Sappho ; there is the same flow of passion, the same indescribable power of painting the agony of desire. In these features they both contrast with the gentler and more resigned complaints of Mimnermus, who naturally uses the calm elegiac metre, while the others felt the necessity of shorter and more hurried rhythms. The dialect of Sappho is more strictly the local language of Mytilene, and not

Venise du temps où le noble Marcello composait pour la haute société du Grand-Canal les psaumes qui ont rendu son nom célèbre : les relations sociales y étaient libres et faciles, quelquefois licencieuses, mais toujours empreintes d'élégance et de cette noblesse de manières qui appartienne aux aristocraties. Du reste le climat des îles et des rivages éoliens est d'une douceur qui tourne à la mollesse, et qui engendre aisément la volupté ; le canal de Lesbos est éclairé le soir d'une suave lumière et parcouru sans cesse par des brises tièdes, mais non énervantes, que parfument les arbustes odoriférants des montagnes. Les richesses et le luxe de l'Asie abondaient sur ces rivages et donnaient aux nobles Grecs de ces contrées ces habitudes de langueur et de poésie passionnée, dont nous retrouvons encore quelque chose dans leurs descendants italiens et asiatiques.'

¹ Horace (*Epist.* i. 19, v. 28) points out clearly the metrical filiation.

so purified as that of Alcæus, but both were full of hard expressions, which are perpetually commented on by lexicographers.

On the whole, antiquity seems to have placed Sappho in the first rank, and despite the variety of subjects and of interests in Alcæus, preferred the pure voice of gentle and womanly feeling in her love poems. But the Alexandrians thought differently, and while several of them edited critical texts of Alcæus, they seem to have paid no similar attention to Sappho. Nevertheless, according to M. Burnouf, both poets survived till the eleventh century A.D., when they were burned at Constantinople and at Rome, in the year 1073, during the popedom of Gregory VII.¹ Thus these inestimable exponents of Greek feeling have only reached us in slight and scattered fragments, most of them by mere grammatical or lexicographical notes.²

§ 130. Their lyrics, apart from the difficult dialect, are far more easy to comprehend than the more elaborate rythms of Pindar, Alcman, or Stesichorus. For instead of long complicated systems, which required all the help of music, and even of dancing, to bring out the symmetry, and carry on the hearer to the antistrophe and the epode, the odes of Alcæus and Sappho were constructed in short simple stanzas, which were easily comprehended, and recitable even without their musical accompaniment. They were in fact the earliest specimens of what is called in modern days the *Song* or *Ballad*, in which the repetition of short rythms produces a certain pleasant monotony, easy to remember, and easy to understand. It is this quality, in contrast with the elaborate systems of Pindar's metres, which makes Horace exclaim that Pindar is inimitable, and which led him to confine himself to the Æolic poets of Lesbos, and their simpler art. We know perhaps as much of Alcæus and Sappho through Horace as through their own fragments. For though the genius of the Roman poet was

¹ Cf. Sittl. p. 331.

² Gregory of Corinth (in twelfth century) professes to have read Alcæus. Eustathius does not know him. Two papyrus frags. of poems in Lesbian dialect, apparently either of Sappho or Alcæus, have recently come from Egypt, and lead us to hope for more. They are now printed in the fourth edition of Bergk's *FLG.* iii. 704. The first account was Blass' in *Rh. Mus.* xxxv. p. 287. The MS. seems to be of the eighth century.

totally different, though the political and erotic passions of the Greek artistocrat were not only strange to his nature, but the very reverse of his teaching, yet he adhered so closely to the idiom as well as the measures of his models, that much of the old Greek grace and some of the fire are felt through the colder medium of his translations.

But while Romans and moderns have proclaimed this side of the lyric poetry as the best and the most perfect, the verdict of the Greeks was quite different. No one doubted the intense genius of both poets, or of their successor, Anacreon; Sappho especially is praised through all Greek literature as a tenth Muse, as equal to Homer, as unapproachable in grace and sweetness. Yet the course and development of lyric poetry drifted away from them; the simple song did not speak to the Greeks like the great choral systems of Stesichorus and Arion, and thus the last and most perfect development of this kind of poetry, of the melos of the Greeks, was no offshoot of the school of Lesbos. For the character of this Lesbian poetry was such as to dispense with *orchestic*, and this was to the Greeks so important an element in melic poetry, that the higher kinds were not to be appreciated without it. All this will appear clearly when we come to treat of choral lyric poetry.

The poems of Alcæus were divided according to subjects—first *Hymns*, then *Stasiotica*, telling of adventures in politics and war, then *Skolia*,¹ then *Erotica*; nor were the latter three very clearly distinguished. Two books are cited from the editions of Aristophanes and Aristarchus. Sappho's poems, on the contrary, were divided into at least nine books, and according to metres, but all called indiscriminately μέλη. She wrote hymns, like Alcæus, but both poets composed in a free and secular spirit, nor did they take their place among the really religious poets of the Greeks. Their metres are very various—some of them very difficult to analyse in our fragments, and there is no reason to think that what we know as the Alcaic and Sapphic metres were the most prominent in their works. They are so fully described in the prefaces to Horace,² that I need not

¹ Cf. Engelbrecht, *De Skol. Poesi*, Wien, 1882.

² Cf. also the account of Flach, *Gr. L.* p. 479, sq., and 514, sq., who gives many more than Horace used.

detail them here. Sappho was said to have first introduced the key known as Mixo-Lydia, and to have raised the epithalamium to a place in artistic poetry, though the form seems to have been fixed by Alcman or Stesichorus. Her two longer extant fragments have been preserved as specimens of excellence by Dionysius and Longinus.¹

We have no fragment equally long from the works of Alcæus, though there are many beautiful thoughts still surviving, such as that cited by Plutarch, which makes Eros the child of Iris and the West wind—of the sunlit showers and soft breezes of spring. His fragment 40 is directly copied from a passage in Hesiod—if both do not repeat an older popular song. His metaphor of a storm-tossed ship for the agitated state became at once a commonplace in Greek literature.²

- ¹ Φαίνεται μοι κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν
ἔμμεν' ὦνερ, ὅστις ἐναντίος τοι
ἰζάνει, καὶ πλασίον ἄδῃ φωνεύ-
σας ὑπακούει
καὶ γελαίσας ἱμερόεν· τό μοι μὰν
καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόασεν,
ὥς γὰρ εὔιδον βροχέως σε, φωνᾷς
οὐδὲν ἔτ' εἴκει·
ἀλλὰ καὶ μὲν γλῶσσα ξαγε· λεπτόν δ'
αὔτικα χρῶ πῦρ ὑποδεδρόμακεν·
ὀππάτεσσιν δ' οὐδὲν ὕρημ', ἐπιβρομ-
βεῦσι δ' ἄκουαι·
ἀ δέ μ' ἴδρως κακχέεται, τρόμος δὲ
πᾶσαν ἀγρεῖ, χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας
ἔμμι· τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω 'πιδεύης
φαίνομαι ἄλλα.
ἀλλὰ πᾶν τολματόν—
- ² Ἀσυνέτημι τῶν ἀνέμων στάσιν·
τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔνθεν κύμα κυλίνδεται,
τὸ δ' ἔνθεν· ἄμμες δ' ἂν τὸ μέσσον
νῆϊ φορήμεθα σὺν μελαίνῃ,
χείμωνι μοχθεῦντες μεγάλῃ μάλα·
περ μὲν γὰρ ἄντλος ἰστίοι πεδαν ἔχει,
λαῖφος δὲ πᾶν ζάδῃλον ἤδη
καὶ λακίδες μέγαλαι κατ' αὐτό·
χόλαιοι δ' ἔγκυραι—

Horace's imitation (*Od.* i. 10) of his Hymn to Hermes (fragg. 5-8) is

§ 131. This is the proper place, in accordance with the plan of my work, to notice the three imitations of the dialect, metre, and manner of the old Æolic poets by the Alexandrian Theocritus. They are the 28th, 29th, and 30th idylls in the collection ascribed to him (at least in the most recent editions, such as Ziegler's and Fritzsche's second editions), for the last of them was only recovered from a Milan MS. in the year 1864. The 28th is an elegant little address to an ivory spindle which the poet was sending as a present to the wife of his physician-friend, Nikias of Kos, and was probably composed on the model of a poem of Sappho. The other two are properly called παιδικὰ Αἰολικά, and are poems on the sort of love most prominent in the society of Alcæus. One of them has been even suspected to be the real work of Alcæus. To me that last in order, though in a most corrupt and hopeless state, as anyone may see in the transcript printed by Fritzsche before his emended version, seems poetically the best, and is full of grace and elegance. The dialect is believed to be an artificial Doric, to some extent coloured with the later local speech. The metres are either the *asclepiadics* common in Horace's Odes, which are imitated from the same source, or what are called Æolic dactyls. There is no trace of strophes in any of the three poems. Though Theocritus was probably one of the best imitators in any age, it cannot be said that this attempt to reproduce the love poetry of Alcæus has made much impression upon the world. It is, at all events, quite eclipsed by his bucolic side, in which his originals were far less known and less splendid, and his imitation fresher and full of genius.

well known, and the sophist Himerios (*Or.* 14, 10) has paraphrased his Pæan to Apollo (Sittl, p. 320). An epithalamium can be reconstructed from frags. 93-7, Catullus' copy (*Carm.* 62), and the paraphrase of Himerios (cf. Bergk, *LG.* iii. p. 121). The unusual forms of the Æolic dialect make the readings of all these fragments very uncertain and contested. We have now a bold attempt to reconstitute the text from Fick in his *Odyssee*, pp. 22-3. This is done with a special regard to the dialect, in which he justly notes the tendency to *ictus* on accentuated vowels, as opposed to the lengthening of the Ionic dialect. Cf. ἄμμε, &c., ἐννήμαρ (•ιι•άερες in Ionic).

CHAPTER XI.

THE PROGRESS OF PERSONAL POETRY.

§ 132. WE now come to the epoch of Greek poetry which was so brilliant and many sided, that it is not possible to treat it in chronological order, nor to separate clearly the various threads, which were becoming closely connected and interlaced. We find Ol. 60 mentioned as the date of the flourishing of so many poets, that we begin to wonder what circumstances favoured literature at this juncture. Of the many which suggest themselves, three may be noted as of great breadth and importance. First, the caste feeling of the Greek aristocracy was brought out and intensified by the conflicts with tyrants and democracies; and this stimulated the bitter hate, and the complaints of travel, of exile, and of unfriendliness, which we find repeated in the remains of Theognis. Secondly, the rise of brilliant courts under the tyrants, who reached perhaps their highest point about this time—Samos, Syracuse, Athens, Corinth were now swayed by them—had again created a lofty patronage for poets, and high remuneration for their art, not to speak of the rivalry among the cities of victors at the games to obtain their praises. Most of the later lyric poets would have greatly disgusted Alcæus or Solon. They had sunk back to the social position of dependants on princes, like the old epic rhapsodes, when they did not assert their liberty in turbulent exile by vehement and bitter railing. Still the comforts and luxuries which attend well-paid and well-honoured court poets favoured Anacreon, and Pindar, and Simonides of Keos, and many others who lived in the great art-centres of Greece.

There remains yet a third widely different reason. While education and consequently literature were being more and

more disseminated, prose had not yet been adopted as a vehicle of thought, and thus the whole intellectual outcome of the nation took the form of verse. Much of what remains is indeed prosaic in idea. Xenophanes followed the older wise men in attempting to clothe philosophy—and this time real philosophy—in a poetic form. The wisdom of Phokylides and of Theognis is not half so poetical as Plato's prose. But the Greeks awoke very slowly, as is well known, to the necessity of laying aside metre in writing for the public, and even when they did, we shall find their prose never shaking off a painful attention to rhythm.

Thus the whole of the Hellenic world, now better informed, better read, better educated, had no other expression than poetry, and so this age, the end of the sixth century, became the greatest and most brilliant epoch in all the history of Greek poetry. Now for the first time, perhaps for the only time, the Greeks of Sicily, Italy, Hellas, Africa, the islands, and of Asia Minor were all contributing independently to the national literature. They did not all crowd to Sparta, as formerly, or to Athens, as afterwards. They were not all epic poets, as of old, or dramatic, as all the great ones of later days. They kept up elegiac, iambic, and hexameter verse ; they cultivated personal and choral lyrics with equal success ; nor was it till the close of this epoch that the latter form of lyrics asserted itself as having gained the suffrages of the entire Hellenic world. For this reason I have left the history of public choral poetry to the last, and will not take it up till I have sketched the varied developments of personal poetry in connection with the authors already discussed.

§ 133. Unfortunately, our most considerable remains from this epoch are those of elegiac poetry, which was perhaps the poorest and least characteristic species. Its day was gone, and with the exception of its survival in epigrams, it fell asleep till it was resuscitated by the Alexandrians, and became a favourite form of Roman poetry. Thus at this period, elegiacs and the lame iambics of Hipponax seem to have been the form adopted by less poetic minds, which would in a later century have spoken simple prose. We have a few pithy fragments of PHOKYLIDES of Miletus, giving his experiences in short proverbs

with the formula *This too is Phokylides*' (καὶ τόδε Φωκυλίδεω), but we know nothing of his life (flor. Ol. 60). He imitates Semonides in satirising women by comparing them to domestic animals; he speaks of Nineveh familiarly as a great city; he wishes to be of the middle class (μέσος ἐν πόλει), and even ridicules the advantages of high birth, so that he can in no wise be regarded as an instance of the common statement, that all the poets of the lyric age were aristocrats. He rather follows the Hesiodic school. There are similar feelings scattered through the collection called that of Theognis, not to speak of Hipponax. But of Phokylides nothing more can be learned.¹

§ 134. XENOPHANES (of Colophon, son of Dexios, most of whose wandering life was spent in Sicily, and at Elea, in Italy, which he helped to found, according to Diogenes L.) is a clearer personality, whose life is not only in other respects very interesting,² but whose extant fragments are far the finest left us from this epoch of the elegy, if not altogether the finest we possess. The first describes the conditions of a really pleasant feast³; the second is an attack on the increasing mania for

¹ I purposely pass by in silence the spurious moral poem once attributed to him, consisting of some 250 hexameters (Bergk, pp. 455-75) neatly put together, and stating the Jewish moral code pretty completely. There can be no doubt that it is the work of a late Alexandrian Jew, but before the spread of Christianity.

² He seems to have written as much in epic hexameters (on which cf. above, p. 138) as in elegiac form. In hexameters he also composed *Silli*, or parodies ridiculing not only Homer but earlier poets and philosophers. These attacks were scourged by Timon of Phlius, who took their form as his model. The judgment of Flach (pp. 419-22) on this poet is very different from mine. He blames him for self-consciousness, a love of abstraction, and a want of interest in the public affairs of the day.

³ Νῦν γὰρ δὴ ζάπεδον καθάρν καὶ χεῖρες ἀπάντων
καὶ κύλικες· πλεκτοὺς δ' ἀμφιτιθεῖ στεφάνους
ἄλλος δ' εὐῶδες μύρον ἐν φιάλῃ παρατείνει·
κρητὴρ δ' ἔστηκεν μεστὸς εὐφροσύνης·
οἶνος δ' ἔστιν ἔτοιμος, ὃς οὐποτε φησὶ προδώσειν,
μείλιχος ἐν κεράμοις ἄνθεος ὁσδόμενος
ἐν δὲ μέσοις ἀγνὴν ὁδὴν λιβανωτὸς ἴησιν,
ψυχρὸν δ' ἔστιν ὕδωρ καὶ γλυκὺ καὶ καθάρν·
πάρκεινται δ' ἄρτι ξανθοὶ γεραρὴ τέ τράπεζα

athletics and for physical training, which, keeping pace with the growing national importance of the public games, began to infest Greece, very much as it has been infesting the England of later years. We know that Solon had protested against this evil a generation earlier, and had diminished the public rewards given to victors at the games. In the next century Euripides (whose scholiast quotes this fragment of Xenophanes) writes in the same spirit. In later days generals like Alexander and Philopœmen set their faces steadily against athletic training as unserviceable for military purposes. We hear from Xenophanes (fr. 7) that he began to philosophize at the age of twenty-five, and had been spreading his thoughts through Greece for sixty-seven years, so that it is probable (as he mentions the rise of the Persians, fr. 3) that his activity began while Solon was yet alive, at all events in the sixth century.¹

§ 135. The same may certainly be said of his contemporary THEOGNIS, under whose name we have a little volume of

τυροῦ καὶ μέλιτος πίονος ἀχθομένη·
 βωμὸς δ' ἄνθουσιν ἂν τὸ μέσον πάντα κεπύκασται,
 μολπῇ δ' ἀμφὶς ἔχει δώματα καὶ θαλίη.
 χρὴ δὴ πρῶτον μὲν θεὸν ὑμνεῖν εὐφρονας ἄνδρας
 εὐφήμοις μύθοις καὶ καθαροῖσι λόγοις.
 σπείσαντας δὲ καὶ εὐξαμένους τὰ δίκαια δύνασθαι
 πρήσσειν· ταῦτα γὰρ ὦν ἐστὶ προαιρετέον,
 οὐχ ὕβρεις πίνειν δ' ὁπόσον κεν ἔχων ἀφίκοιο
 οἴκαδ' ἄνευ προπόλου, μὴ πάνυ γηραλέος·
 ἀνδρῶν δ' αἰνεῖν τοῦτον, ὃς ἐσθλὰ πῶν ἀναφαίρη,
 ὥς οἱ μνημοσύνη καὶ νόος ἀμφ' ἀρετῆς·
 οὔτι μάχας διέπειν Τιτῆων οὐδὲ Γιγάντων,
 οὐδὲ τὰ Κενταύρων, πλάσματα τῶν προτέρων
 ἢ στάσις σφεδανὰς· τοῖς οὐδὲν χρηστὸν ἔνεστιν·
 θεῶν δὲ προμηθεῖην αἰὲν ἔχειν ἀγαθόν.

¹ Bergk places his appearance as a philosopher so far back as Ol. 46, 7, so that he would come quite close to Thales; and this would account for his not departing from the poetical form of teaching, as Heracleitus did, whose work may be fifty years later. But this explanation is unnecessary; cf. above, p. 139. Flach (p. 416) adds that, coming from the home of Mimnermus, he would naturally write elegies, one of which seems to have been on the founding of Colophon, (frag. 3 in Bergk's *FLG.*). On his philosophy, cf. above, p. 138.

elegies (nearly 1,400 lines) of which the greater part, called the first book, contains all manner of political and social advices, while the rest is devoted to amorous complaints of the coldness or faithlessness of a favourite boy, whom the poet addressed throughout his works. From the allusions in these poems it appears that Theognis, who belonged to Megara in Greece, though he is also called a citizen of the Sicilian Megara, was one of the old aristocratic party, which had crushed and oppressed the lower classes, till, after many internal feuds and troubles, Theagenes, the father-in-law of Kylon, defeated and exiled the oppressors, and gave liberty and property to the common people. After the fall of Theagenes the party struggles recommenced, but with this difference, that the people had got possession of a considerable portion of the property of the better classes, and entered upon the conflict with some idea of their own rights and claims. This was of course most galling to the aristocrats, who remembered their opponents 'wandering about in sheepskins and goatskins,' and glad to accept any benevolences in their despair.

The genuine elegies of Theognis (*γνωμολογία δι' ἐλεγείων*), appear to have been advices to a young aristocratic favourite, *perhaps* his ward, Kyrnus, also called by the patronymic Polypaides, on the importance of high breeding, on the essential vileness of the lower classes, on the decay of party spirit among the Megarian nobles, and the rising influence of wealth. The nobles are called *the good*, as we call them the *better* classes, and the mere citizens (*ἄστοί*) are called the bad systematically, but by no means in such a way as to warrant the absurd inference that in the poet's mind *good* (*ἀγαθός*, *εὐθλός*) and *bad* (*κακός*) had a purely political meaning. There are ample evidences in the elegies of these words in their strictly moral sense, which indeed was established long before Theognis. The many elegies addressed to other people by name are explained by Flach (p. 408), to be addresses to various members of an aristocratic dining club, and he cites Suidas' note : καὶ ἑτέρας ὑποθήκας παραινετικάς.

There are other allusions, such as to the threatened wars of the Medes, which might lead us to further inferences about

the poet's life, if the elegies now collected under his name were the unalloyed expressions of one poet, and not a sort of politico-moral 'elegant extracts' put together for educational purposes, long after the poet's death, and without any attempt to maintain his real teaching. There is no Greek poet to whom the application of this Wolfian theory has been more eminently successful. The allusions to the Lelantine war on the one hand, and to the Medes on the other, stretch far beyond the life of any one man,¹ even were he to make such flagrantly inconsistent assertions about morals and politics as are found in the collection. Moreover, lines elsewhere preserved as Solon's and as Tyrtæus's reappear as Theognis's; and with this change, that in more than one case the opening and concluding lines (containing some general summary or reflection) are set down, omitting the body of the poem, as it appears in Stobæus, and as assigned to the older author. This shows clearly the intentions of the compiler. He only wanted moral saws, and not personal poems. Bergk, who has worked all this out, shows furthermore that only the old elegiasts are excerpted, no notice being taken of such poets as Ion or Critias. The date of the compilation is limited by a passage of Isocrates, who wishes that such a collection were made, and again in the other direction by a passage in Plato's *Laws* (also *Menon*, 95 E), who says that some such plan was being adopted by practical educators. Our so-called Theognis therefore probably took its present form about the middle of the fourth century.² I have already noticed how there is perhaps a fragment of Bias of Priene, among others, here preserved to us. Possibly Callinus and Mimnermus are also represented. Unfortunately, the most valuable parts, both historically and æsthetically, have been

¹ Flach (*L.G.* p. 392) argues, from the allusions to the Medes, that the subjugation of Ionia was begun by Mazares, and followed up by Harpagus 545 B.C. This agrees with the chronographers, who place Theognis's *floruit* in Ol. 59 or 60, at least approximately. Cf. also the suggestion of Gutschmid, quoted by Flach, p. 410.

² An account of our book is quoted by Stobæus from Xenophon, for whose name various others have been conjectured by the learned. Cf. Flach, *op. cit.* p. 401.

omitted by the dry schoolmaster who made the selection. The poetical value of the collection is small, and the tone approaches the modesty and tameness of prose, as old critics observed. The convivial fragments are perhaps the best. It is to be remarked that the *second book*,¹ which contains love-complaints almost exclusively, breathes a manly and vigorous tone, and reminds us of what the ancients have reported of the character of such attachments among the old Cretans and Eubœans. Fragments of the poems seem indeed to refer to Eubœa, others to Sparta, and the whole is composed in the educated Ionic dialect, which was far removed from the ordinary speech of the Megarians.² This is accordingly the most striking instance of the close connection between a peculiar dialect and a peculiar form of poetry, to the exclusion of the ordinary language of the poet.

§ 136. *Bibliographical.* As to MSS. they are very numerous, at Paris and the Vatican especially, but also at Venice, Florence, and elsewhere. Bekker's collation has shown the paramount value of one (A) known as *Mutinensis* (which alone contains the second book), now in Paris (*Codd. Græc. Suppl.* 388), but he has not specified its age. Then one (K) of the Venetian (Marc. 522), and one (O) of the Vatican (Vatic. 915), which have been shown by Bergk to be of separate and considerable value.³ All the rest are far inferior and not independent. The *editio princeps* is the Aldine of 1495 (together with Theocritus, Hesiod, &c.); the most important subsequently are those of Camerarius (1551), of Brunck and Gaisford (as *Poetæ Gnomici*). The critical editions are by Bekker (2nd ed., Berlin, 1827), Welcker (1826), Orelli (1840), Ziegler (2nd ed., 1880), Sitzler (Hdbg. 1880) with an index, and in Bergk's *Lyric Poets*. There are four or five German translations, and a partial English version

¹ It is regarded as mostly a set of silly parodies, dating from shortly before the Alexandrian period, by Welcker (and also by Flach).

² It has been argued that there are still traces of the Doric digamma in the best MS., but this seems doubtful. Cf. Flach, p. 412.

³ The authority for the many citations in Stobæus for emending the text is discussed in tracts by Krüger (Königsbg. Diss. 1882) and H. Schneidewin (Stettin, 1882).

in J. H. Frere's *Theognis Restitutus* (*Works*, vol. iii.), which endeavours to construct the poet's life and opinions from his poems; but the whole attempt is vitiated by the assumption of the unity of authorship of our text. The somewhat similar speculation of O. Müller in his *History of Greek Literature* has been severely handled by Bergk (*Neues Rhein. Mus.* vol. 111, pp. 227, sq.).

§ 137. We may here fitly sum up in a few words the later history of the elegy, which for us may be said to close with Theognis. There were indeed many other elegiac poets, both Ionic and Attic, of whom traces still remain, but to us they are lost, nor have we reason to think that if extant they would occupy a high place in Greek Literature. The last important poem of the species in older days was the *Lyde* of Antimachus, whose learned epic was above mentioned (§ 109). This lament on the death of his beloved was a sort of *In Memoriam*, like the great poem of our own day, passing from personal grief into larger questions—but in Antimachus questions of mythical and genealogical lore. Though good critics always speak of the poet as laboured and pedantic, there can be no doubt that his elegy, as well as his learned epic, had great influence in moulding both the epics and elegiacs of Alexandria, where these cold and formal qualities were in high repute. The few extant lines of the *Lyde* give us no idea of the poem.¹ There are other well-known names handed down to us as having composed social elegies, principally at Athens, such as Ion of Chios, Euenus of Paros, and a certain Dionysius (nicknamed 'the Copper'), from all of whom a few lines survive of grace and of elegant workmanship.² In the next generation the notorious CRITIAS,

¹ Bergk, *FLG*, p. 610.

² From Ion, indeed, two complete elegies for banquets, dithyrambic in style, and difficult of interpretation, one of them for the Spartan royal house of Prokles. There is also a poem on the famous innovation of Timotheus, who raised the number of the strings of the lyre to eleven. Cf. Bergk, *FLG*, iii. 1, 251. The elegy to Eudemus, attributed with good reason to Aristotle, is also remarkable, and has been cited among his fragments in my chap. upon him in vol. ii. of this work (2, p. 184). The elegy quoted by Demosthenes (*De Corona*, § 289) appears to be copied from an old tomb-relief, and fitted into its place by some early editor.

among his varied literary work, composed political elegies, or descriptions of polities (πολιτεῖαι ἔμμετροι is their title), in the style, though far removed from the temper, of Solon, and of these two considerable and interesting fragments survive.¹

§ 138. An elegiac complaint in the *Andromache* of Euripides,² in Doric dialect, is a curiosity in dramatic literature. But while we have these few formal representatives of sustained composition in elegiac metre, it seems that with Simonides came in the fashion³ of composing short epigrams of a votive character on monuments, or epitaphs on tombs, for which that form was generally adopted. Those of Simonides were most famous, but in the later collections of the anthologies we have short elegiac inscriptions attributed to all manner of literary men, tragic poets like Æschylus and Euripides, lyric poets, even to prose writers like Thucydides and Plato.⁴ The genuine-

¹ Frag. 2 : Καὶ τόδ' ἔθος Σπάρτη μελέτημά τε κείμενον ἔστιν

πίνειν τὴν αὐτὴν οἰνοφόρον κύλικα,
μηδ' ἀποδωρεῖσθαι προπόσεις ὀνομαστί λέγοντα,
μηδ' ἐπὶ δεξιτερὰν χεῖρα κυκλοῦν θιάσου
ἄγγεα .

. . . Λυδὴ χεῖρ εἶρ' Ἀσιατογενῆς,
καὶ προπόσεις ὀρέγειν ἐπιδέξια, καὶ προκαλεῖσθαι
ἐξονομακλήδην, ᾧ προπιεῖν ἐθέλει.

εἴτ' ἀπὸ τοιούτων πόσεων γλώσσας τε λύουσιν
εἰς αἰσχροὺς μύθους, σῶμά τ' ἀμαυρότερον
τεύχουσιν· πρὸς δ' ὕμματ' ἀχλὺς ἀμβλωπὸς ἐφίξει·
λῆστις δ' ἐκτῇκει μνημοσύνην πραπίδων·
νοῦς δὲ παρέσφαλται· δμῶες δ' ἀκόλαστον ἔχουσιν
ἦθος· ἐπεισπίπτει δ' οἰκοτριβὴς δαπάνη.

οἱ Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ κόροι πίνουσι τοσοῦτον,
ῶστε φρέν' εἰς ἱλαρὰν ἐλπίδα πάντ' ἀπάγειν,
εἷς τε φιλοφροσύνην γλώσσαν μέτριον τε γέλωτα.
τοιαύτη δὲ πόσις σώματί τ' ὠφέλιμος
γνώμῃ τε κτήσεται· καλῶς δ' εἰς ἔργ' Ἀφροδίτης,
πρὸς θ' ὕπνον ἤρμους, τὸν καμάτων λιμένα,
πρὸς τὴν τερπνοτάτην τε θεῶν θνητοῖς Ἑγίειαν,
καὶ τὴν Εὐσεβίης γαίτονα Σωφροσύνην, κ.τ.λ.

² vv. 104, sq.

³ But compare p. 198, note on Demodocus of Leros.

⁴ On the history and development of the epigram cf. now Flach, pp. 441 sq., who gives all the modern authorities. Starting from Junghahn's

ness of these little pieces is always a very difficult question ; but that the general fashion prevailed, and that various literary men amused themselves in this way, apart from great competitions for public dedications, is certain. The reader will find in Bergk's *Lyrici* many such epigrams of great beauty under the authors to whom they were attributed. To discuss them together is rather the task of the historian of post-classical literature. For the Alexandrians not only revived the Ionic elegy in the hands of Callimachus, Philetas, Eratosthenes, Parthenius, and others, but exercised their wits in making subtle epigrams full of dainty conceits. These are well worth reading in the anthology, where they are confused with many specimens of older and simpler work, and have been tastefully reviewed in a special chapter of Mr. Symonds' *Greek Poets*.

The erotic elegy of Callimachus, Philetas and their school is chiefly interesting as having been the model of the Roman elegy, which is one of the glories of Latin literature in the hands of Ovid, Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius. But the scanty remains of Callimachus,¹ and the almost total loss of the others, relieve me of the necessity of discussing them with the detail I have allowed to Apollonius.² Yet it is from the Alexandrian and Roman elegy that the whole modern notion of that kind of poem has been derived. Thus the exceptional *Nanno* of Mimnermus was more lasting in idea than the far more ambitious and famous works of Solon and Theognis, of Xenophanes and Tyrtaeus.³

tract (1869) on Simonides, Kaibel (*J. Jahrb.* vol. cv. 801) ; Bergk (in his *FLG.* pp. 446, sq.), and Kirchhoff on the history of the Attic elegy (*Hermes*, vol. v.), have collected all the evidence for the genuineness of the epigrams ascribed to great Greek poets.

¹ One elegy on the annual bathing of the statue of Athene at Argos in the Inachus, 140 lines in Doric dialect, and after the style of a Homeric hymn, on the adventures of Athene in Boeotia, and the blinding of Teiresias. On Callimachus, cf. above, § 102.

² The reader will now find a review and appreciation of Callimachus and his rivals in my *Greek Life and Thought*, chap. xi., and of the principal epigrammatists in the last chapter of my *Greek World under Roman Sway*.

³ Flach, p. 439, gives a good summary of the three stages of the elegy :

§ 139. While the elegy had taken its completed *pragmatical* form in Theognis, and while, as we shall see, Ibycus and Anacreon were each following up special forms of lyric poetry, the iambic metre, of which we hear hardly anything since the elder Semonides, revived with peculiar modifications under the hands of HIPPONAX of Ephesus, who is generally mentioned as the third iambic poet of the Greeks, along with Archilochus and Semonides. He lived about the 6th Ol. at Clazomenæ, being exiled from his native town by the tyrants Athenagoras and Comas, and was chiefly noted for his scurrilous poems on Bupalus and Athenio, the celebrated sculptors, who had represented or exaggerated his personal deformity in a portrait statue. He seems, however, also to have attacked a contemporary painter, and to have been a man of violent hates, and of an unhappy life. Ovid (in his *Ibis*) says that he died of hunger, but this may be a poetical inference from the complaints of cold and hunger in his extant fragments, which German critics take seriously, but which are more probably the comic outbursts of a somewhat low and pleasure-loving nature, as we may guess from the many allusions to cookery quoted from him. Though he used ordinary iambic trimeters, tetrameters, and also hexameters in epic parodies (which he perhaps invented), his distinctive feature was the use of *choliambics*, or iambics ending with a spondee, which, according to the Germans, gives the metre a halting low plebeian tone, only fit for vulgar and coarse subjects. Nevertheless, the refined Callimachus and Babrius came to use it for short fables of an innocent and even graceful description. There is no poetical beauty in the extant fragments, which are chiefly cited by grammarians either for peculiar customs, such as the sacrificing of *φάρμακοί*—the human sin offerings at the Thargelia—or for hard and obscene words, probably local or slang in character. Though well-known and oft quoted, Hipponax naturally formed no school, but there are fragments of a certain Ananius, who wrote in the same metre, and who seems to have lived about the same time. The constant invocations of Hermes in the fragments of Hipponax are viz. (1) didactic and patriotic; (2) didactic and ethical; (3) didactic and artificial.

remarkable, and point to some unexplained cause. This god may possibly have been the favourite deity of the lower classes in Ionic cities, and represented in the streets, as we know was the case at Athens. The names of the later choliambists are not worth enumerating.¹

The spirit of personal satire was transmitted to Attic comedy, which is generally agreed to have started with an iambic vein, and in its political days, the attacks of the comic poets on leading men, or on notorious libertines at Athens were not less direct and angry than the verses of Archilochus and Hipponax. The close alliance in spirit between these two branches of Greek poetry is further illustrated by the fact that Hermippus, one of the bitterest opponents of Pericles among the old comic poets, was also the author of a book of iambic and trochaic poems, often quoted both by Athenæus and the scholiasts on Aristophanes.² These poems were personal attacks of the same kind as those in the parabasis of the earlier comedies, but here even in form imitated from the ancient masters of satire among the Greeks.³

§ 140. The most striking possible contrast to Hipponax was his contemporary ANACREON of Teos, who migrated with his townspeople to Abdera, when they were driven out by Harpargus.

¹ Cf. Bergk, *FLG.* pp. 788, sq. Herodas alone is still of interest, and his fragments worth reading. But his date is variously assigned from the age of Xenophon to that of Callimachus, and his history unknown. To him is ascribed the invention of *Mimiambics* (dramatic choliambics) and also of *Hemiambics*, the dimeter catalectic iambics so common in the Anacreontics. I strongly suspect these two titles refer to the same thing, though carefully separated by modern critics. *Meliambics* (whatever they were) were ascribed to Kerkidas, the contemporary of Philip of Macedon.

² Cf. Meineke, *Hist. Com.* p. 96.

³ When the Romans lay claim to the invention of *satire*, as their sole originality in poetry, it is to be remembered that this is only true in the peculiar Roman sense of *satira*, as a *poetical medley*, such as the satires of Horace and Persius; and this we are not in a position to deny, as we have lost the mimes of Sophron. But we know that Sophron was the model of the latter, and therefore may have anticipated this phase of literature also. To say that satire, in the other and now received sense, was invented by the Romans is quite ridiculous.

From thence he was called to grace the court of Polycrates of Samos, then the greatest man in the Greek world; and after Polycrates' murder he is said to have passed his old age with the scarcely less splendid Hipparchus at Athens. Of his death nothing certain is known.¹ Instead of the low virulence and bitter wants of Hipponax's life, we have here an accomplished courtier, a votary of love and wine, a man who enjoyed every human pleasure to the full, and felt no trouble save the touch of silver in his hair, and the scorn of stately youth or fair maiden for his advancing years. He concerned himself with no politics; he gave no serious advice in morals; he stands aloof from all the higher aims and aspirations of his age; he was essentially 'the idle singer of an empty day,' the minion in poetry of a luxurious and sensual court. The vigorous attack on Artemon (fr. 21) seems incited by erotic jealousy; the hymns to Dionysus, who is with him as prominent as Hermes with Hipponax, were in no sense religious, but worldly compositions. Fr. 2 seems a complete hymn, and among the few certainly genuine remains of the poet:

Ὠνάξ, ᾧ δαμάλης Ἔρως
καὶ Νύμφαι κυανώπιδες
πορφυρέη τ' Ἀφροδίτῃ
συνπαΐζουσιν· ἐπιστρέφει δ'
ὕψηλῶν κορυφᾶς ὀρέων,
γουνούμαί σε· σὺ δ' εὐμενῆς
ἔλθ' ἡμῖν, κεχαρισμένης δ'
εὐχολῆς ἐπακούειν.
Κλευβούλῃ δ' ἀγαθὸς γενεῖ
σύμβουλος· τὸν ἐμὸν δ' ἔρωτ',
ὦ Δεύνυσε, δέχεσθαι.

But this want of seriousness reached the very core of his nature. His praise of love and of wine are not the passionate outbursts of Archilochus or Alcæus, but the elegant encomia of an Aristippus, who lays hold of pleasure, but is not held by it. The glow of passion and the pang of grief could not agitate that worldly and selfish soul, even though he ventures to assert

¹ There was a famous bronze statue of him on the Acropolis of Athens, which Pausanias saw (i. 25. 1) of which the Borghese Anacreon *may* be a copy.

'that Eros struck at him with a mighty axe, and plunged him in a wintry torrent.' The great body of his fragments,¹ and the numerous imitations of his poems, speak of love as an engrossing amusement, of feasting as spoilt by earnest conversation, nay even of old age with a sort of jovial regret, very different from the dark laments of the earnest Mimnermus. The poetry of Anacreon is no longer the outburst of pent-up passion, but the exercise of a graceful talent, the ornament of a luxurious leisure. Had the court of Augustus not affected moral reforms and national aims, we should have had in Horace a very similar poet. In both the very absence of intensity permitted a peculiar polish and grace of form, so much so, that no Greek poet excels Anacreon in the variety and elegance of his metres, or in the purity of his diction.²

It was for this very reason, because perfect form was combined with trivial and shallow sentiment, that the Alexandrians, Romans, and the poetasters of a worn-out culture chose him above all others as their most suitable model. For a long time the Anacreontics composed in the schools of the fourth century A.D., especially at Gaza, imposed their conceits upon the world as the work of Anacreon—an imposture of which the brilliant translations of Thomas Moore are a happy result, but an imposture inconceivable had they attempted to copy the red-hot aristocrats, whose lyrics spoke their troubled and turbulent life. I will not discuss these well-known love poems, which were printed repeatedly with great elegance at Parma and at Rome in the last century, so much so that they have become of considerable value to lovers of beautiful books. The Roman reproduction in plates and in type of the eleventh century Palatine MS. (Spaletti, 1781) is particularly interesting. They are again edited with more care than they deserve by Val. Rose

¹ They are elegantly characterised by Critias (in his 7th extant fragment, Bergk, p. 695) as *συμποσίων ἐρέθισμα, γυναικῶν ἡπερόπευμα, αὐλῶν ἀντίπαλον, φιλοβάρβιτον, ἡδύν, ἔλυπον*.

² Cf. Flach's careful account of his various metres (*L.G.* p. 542, sq.), who justly calls him the most universal of all the Æolian yrists. He also notes that Anacreon alludes to more and more complex instruments than his predecessors.

and by Bergk, though they are not without a certain elegance, and have produced innumerable translations and imitations. To us they are chiefly useful as evidences of the effect produced by the complete works of Anacreon upon the schools which studied him.

In form Anacreon belongs to the Æolic school of Sappho and Alcæus, and his poems were sung without chorus to the accompaniment of a lyre of twenty strings. His verses were monostrophic, like theirs, repeating simple but varied rythms, mixed iambs, choriambics, and tribrachs, after the manner of the verses of our modern songs. But he seems to have avoided the special metres called by us Alcaic and Sapphic, and to have preferred glyconics. In adopting this simple and personal form of the Æolic bards, he was led by a truer instinct than his contemporary Ibycus, who attempted to combine the erotic tone of the Lesbian school with the choral lyric form of the Dorians. But it will be better to class Ibycus with the latter and we shall accordingly return to him.

¹ Stark (*Quæst. Anacr.*), Rose, Hanssen and others have lately been analysing the *Anacreontics* as to metre, dialect, and their analogies to the genuine fragments. The result seems to be that the collection was gradually put together, beginning perhaps about the first century A. D., and embodying many hemiambics from the school of Herodas. Cf. Flach, *L.G.* p. 550, sq.

CHAPTER XII.

THE PUBLIC LYRIC POETRY OF THE GREEKS.

§ 141. WE have already recognised the first beginnings of this strictly Greek form of poetry in our notice of Alcman, though personal allusions are still frequent in his fragments, and his provincial character was noted in contrast to the broader features of his successors. The first of these who is sufficiently important for this brief history is ARION of Methymna, specially celebrated as having organised the dithyrambic¹ choruses in honour of Dionysus, whose worship, orgiastic and oriental in character, had hitherto been unsanctioned by either states or literary men, but was popular about the Isthmus. He arranged the chorus of fifty, so as to produce antistrophic effects, and brought into use dancing—the science of *orchestic*—as subsidiary to music and poetry. Historians of the drama have laid great stress on this improvement of the popular dithyramb. Arion was the first to introduce it into a Doric town, Corinth, and to give the chorus an artistic form, called cyclic, which was not changed till Thespis rearranged his tragic chorus to a square form. It seems, furthermore, that the dithyrambic choruses of Arion were not wildly joyous and licentious, like the original country dances which were his model, but honoured Dionysus as Zagreus, or god of the nether world, in a solemn Doric tone. Arion is even called the inventor of the tragic *tropos*, which corresponded to the ἐμμέλεια, or solemn dance of subsequent

¹ The derivation of the word *dithyrambos*, which appears to have been another name for Dionysus, is not yet satisfactorily explained. It was always used to designate those mimic combinations of music, poetry, and dancing which were performed in honour of the god. It was used by Archilochus, though Herodotus says Arion was the first to name and teach (ὀνομάσαντά τε καὶ διδάξαντα) this lyric exercise.

tragedy. It seems that his cyclic chorus did not wear masks, but was a serious body of men, so that the dithyramb assumed in his hands something of the dignity of the choral worship of Apollo. The rude wild dithyramb of the country folks no doubt still subsisted, but Arion created a new literary form.

These important innovations are indirect inferences, in some cases not very certain, from the stray notes surviving about his literary position, which is little discussed by the ancients. Yet his personal fame was very great, as appears from the story of his being compelled by sailors, who coveted his amassed wealth, to jump into the sea on his return route from Italy, when a dolphin carried him to Tænarum. He reappeared at the court of Periander, to the dismay of his would-be murderers. He seems, in fact, as intimate with Periander as Anacreon was with Polycrates. This fixes his date, and he is besides called a pupil of Alcman. As to the story of the dolphin, our evidence for it is curiously old and respectable. There is the charming narrative of Herodotus (i. 23), who mentions the figure of the poet on a dolphin, dedicated at Tænarum. This figure was well known, and was copied, or paralleled, by numerous coins of Methymna, Corinth, Tarentum, Brundisium, and other cities in Italy. Legends of Tarentum, however, connect both Taras and Phalanthus in a similar way with dolphins, so that we cannot be sure that all the coins represent Arion. But Ælian, in repeating the story, quotes a passage from Arion himself, distinctly alleging the facts. This elegant poem ¹ has been, of course, declared spurious, because

1

ἴψιστε θεῶν,
 πόντιε χρυσοτρίαινα Πόσειδον,
 γαῖδοχ', ἐγκύμον' ἄν' ἄλμαν'
 βραγχίοις περὶ δὲ σὲ πλωτοὶ
 θῆρες χορεύουσι κύκλω,
 κούφοισι ποδῶν ῥίμμασιν
 ἐλάφρ' ἀναπαλλόμενοι, σιμοί,
 φριξαύχενες, ὠκύδρομοι σκύλακες, φιλόμουσοι
 δελφῖνες, ἔναλα θρέμματα
 κυρᾶν Νηρείδων θεῶν,
 ἄς ἐγείνατ' Ἀμφιτρίτα·
 οἷ μ' εἰς Πέλοπος γᾶν ἐπὶ Ταιναρίαν
 ἀκτὰν ἐπορεύσατε πλαζόμενον Σικελῶ ἐνὶ πόντῳ,
 κυρτοῖσι νώτοις ὀχεύντες,

it asserts a miracle, or because it is unworthy of such a poet as Arion—that poet's works being otherwise unknown!!—or because it is supposed to contain Attic modernisms.¹ All these are matters of opinion, and, on the whole, the absence of any mention of the poem by earlier authorities makes me doubt its genuineness, though I suspect it must be the ancient work of some immediate pupil, who passed it off as the poet's own.

It has not, I think, been observed that the close connection between Arion and the cult of Dionysus may have suggested the dolphin legend, for we see from the Homeric hymn to Dionysus (above, p. 151) how that god was early identified with marine adventure, and more especially with dolphins, as a sort of sporting sea satyrs, whose gambollings might be thought analogous to a dancing chorus.

§ 142. There is yet another alleged composer of *tragic choruses*—like Arion's, whose work Herodotus notices in one of his precious literary digressions—*Epigenes* of Sicyon. Herodotus says that the Sicyonians honoured Adrastus in every possible way, and even celebrated his sufferings in tragic choruses, honouring, not Dionysus, but Adrastus. Cleisthenes, for political reasons, restored the due honours to the god. But this early attempt to substitute a mortal hero's sufferings for those of Dionysus is a curious anticipation of the great stride to tragedy made in Attica at the close of the same century.

§ 143. Before passing on, a word may be said on the melic fragments quoted by Diogenes Laertius, as the most favourite of the songs composed by the seven wise men. He cites with this formula (τῶν δὲ ἀδομένων μάλιστα εὐδοκίμησεν αὐτοῦ τάδε) from Pittacus, Bias, Chilo, Thales, and Cleobulus.² The metres are dactyls and trochees combined in logooedic manner. The diction seems antique. Yet I agree with the sceptical critics who deny their genuineness. Diogenes borrowed most

ἔλοκα Νηρείας πλακὸς
τέμνοιντες, ἀστιβῆ πόροι, φῶτες δόλιοι
ὥς μ' ἀφ' ἀλιπλόου γλαφυρᾶς νεῶς
εἰς οἶδμ' ἀλιπόρφυρον λίμνας ἔριψαν.

¹ Especially, according to Flach (i. 351–2), in its metre, which points (he imagines) to the period of the *Attic* dithyramb. Cf. also Sittl, i. p. 316.

² Cf. above p. 198.

of them from the book of the Argive Lobo, about whose age or authority we know nothing.¹

§ 144. The inscription of *Echembrotus* the Arcadian, quoted by Pausanias from a tripod at Thebes, is genuine, and relates that this man contended at Delphi (evidently after the wide growth of the festival) and composed, *for the Hellenes, songs and elegies*. But his date is unknown. Another poet, *Xanthus*, is distinctly mentioned as older than Stesichorus, and his model in some things. But he too is a mere name, and only serves us to introduce his successor.

§ 145. STESICHORUS of Himera was a great figure in Greek literature, and evidently a man of the first importance, but his fragments, though numerous (above 50), do not afford us the materials for an independent judgment. His family was said to proceed from the Locrian colony Mataurus in Sicily, and, as we have seen (p. 121, note), the Locrian legends connect him with Hesiod. His original name is said by Suidas to have been Tisias. He lived about 630–550 B.C., and appears to have died at an advanced age in Catana, where a curious octagon monument, with eight pillars and eight steps, marked his tomb.² As the oldest poet of Sicily, he was specially distinguished. More particularly he is praised for his Homeric tone, and only slightly censured by the later Roman rhetoricians for redundancy. His poems once comprised twenty-six books, of which a group of twelve poems with epic titles is specially noticed, such as *Eriphyla, the Fall of Troy, Helena, the Oresteia*, &c.; of these we shall speak again. There were also religious poems, of which we know very little; songs of revelry, sung in Athens at wine-parties; bucolic love poems about shepherds (particularly Daphnis), which are called by Ælian the forerunners of Theocritus' poetry, and lastly love stories in verse, which seem to have been unlike anything in Greek literature, except the Milesian tales, and their successors, the late Greek novels. Of

¹ He is set down as a mere liar by Hiller in *Rhein. Mus.* xxxiii. pp. 518, sq.

² Ol. 37–56; in Hesychius a tomb at Himera is also mentioned. Flach (i. p. 318, note) says that Sicily was used like *the two Sicilies* afterwards, and puts Matauros in Italy.

these the *Kalyke*, much in fashion among women, told of that maiden being enamoured of a youth, and praying to Aphrodite that she might be joined to him in lawful wedlock ; but when her desire could not be accomplished, she took away her own life. This sentimental poetic novel was remarkable for its moral tone, and indeed all Stesichorus' poetry produces the same impression.

§ 146. His position in the history of Greek religion is very important, for finding the taste for epic recitation decaying, he undertook to reproduce epic stories in lyric dress, and present the substance of the old epics in rich and varied metres, and with the measured movements of a trained chorus. This was a direct step towards the drama, for when any one member of the chorus came to stand apart and address the rest of the choir, we have already the essence of Greek tragedy before us. He added to the strophe and antistrophe the epode, and so gave choral lyric poetry the complete form, found in Pindar and the tragic choruses. But apart from these formal changes, he freely altered and modified the substance of the legends,¹ or perhaps brought into notoriety old and little-known variations which from his day became popular, and passed into Attic tragedy. To judge from like variations in Pindar, some of these changes were suggested by moral lessons, but possibly most of them merely by a love of variety, and of refreshing the somewhat worn-out epic legends. On the siege of Troy especially he differed much from our Homer, and his famous palinodia about Helen gave rise to the most celebrated story about him.² He had, in the opening of a poem, spoken disparagingly of the heroine, who struck him with blindness. He then composed his recantation (the *Ἐλένα*), which asserted that not the real

¹ Flach (i. 338) thinks, from the epic of Peisander.

² From the authorities cited by Bergk (*FLG.* p. 981), it appears that Plato (*Phæd.* 243 A) is our earliest voucher for the legend ; then Isocrates (in his *Encom. Hel.* p. 64). But the fullest account is in Pausanias (iii. 19. 11) and the schol. on Plato. A host of other allusions is also cited. It is important to observe, that among them a scholion on Lycophron speaks of Hesiod as the first deviser of the story of an *εἶδωλον* of Helen.

but a phantom Helen had gone to Troy (a legend recurring in Euripides' *Helena*), and he accordingly recovered his sight.¹

The poet was apparently no politician, though his apologue of the horse who called in a rider to help him against the stag was reported to have been composed for the citizens of Agrigentum to open their eyes to the danger of giving Phalaris the power which he afterwards so grievously misused. The language of Stesichorus, as befitted public choral poetry, was not a local idiom, and is seldom quoted as peculiar by the grammarians, but is epic in tone, and pure and classical in its diction. Though apparently somewhat staid and formal in his style ('Stesichori graves Camenæ'), he is highly praised by Quintilian, Dionysius, and all the critics. Alexander the Great said kings should read him. He was even recited at table, like Simonides, and placed in the Alexandrian canon. Unfortunately, his fragments, chiefly cited for new versions of legends, are more barren than usual for us; nor is there any poet of whom so much has remained, who now presents so indefinite and vague a figure in Greek literature. But he has a certain family likeness to Pindar, whose 4th Pythian ode is probably similar in type to the poems on epic subjects.

§ 147. The remains of the poet IBYCUS are of a far more definite complexion. This poet, a native of Rhegium, flourished about Ol. 60, and has been variously regarded as a successor of Stesichorus, and as an offshoot of the Æolic school. There are strong reasons for both these views, but that which maintains the former is, in my opinion, the more correct. He lived at Polycrates' court, perhaps as the instructor of the tyrant. The poems of Ibycus were essentially choral poems, and intended for public performances. They have the complicated structure of Stesichorus' poems and some fragments on epic subjects ascribed in turn to either poet, show how strong was the similarity between them. Such, at least, are our extant fragments. There are indeed a great many references

¹ The first lines of this palinodia have survived :—

οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος,
οὐδ' ἔβας ἐν ναυσὶν εὐσέλμοις
οὐδ' ἴκεο Πέργαμα Τροίας.

in geographers and scholiasts to Ibycus as an authority on epic legends. But, on the other hand, the exceedingly glowing and beautiful confessions of love, and the fact that these were sometimes addressed to individual youths, seem to place the poet among the personal lyrist of the Æolic school, and suggest that he should be treated along with Sappho and Anacreon. Some critics think he had a Stesichorean epoch in his life, before he left the west and went to Samos, where contact with Anacreon changed his style from Doric choral to Æolic monody. But I can see no evidence sufficient to support this fancy.

It has been surmised that these love poems were not really personal, that the Chalcidians had of old contests of beauty among boys, and openly legalised the love of them, and that Ibycus composed these passionate addresses as the public expression of the love of beauty among his fellow-citizens, so that we have here a literary effort even more artificial and self-conscious than the philosophic gaiety of Anacreon. But such excessive refinements are surely an anachronism in Ibycus' age, and we ought rather to regard his poetry as a very important attempt to combine the chief merits of the Æolic school with the richer and more popular forms of the Doric choral poetry. We know that many of his poems were of this strictly Stesichorean character, and it does not at all appear that he devoted himself wholly to love, like Sappho, or that he touched politics, like Alcæus. On the other hand, we find the feeling of love almost avoided by the public choral lyrics, so that these fragments stand out in peculiar relief. It is very remarkable that this noble attempt of Ibycus did not find imitators. Anacreon and Ibycus are the last lyric poets who touched these magic chords in human nature. The poetry of love disappears (except in *skolia*) during the period of the political greatness of Greece, and only revives as an artificial plant in the decay of its literature. It may have been felt that such personal and private feelings were unsuitable to public choirs, and the artistic sense of the Greeks may have forbidden such a combination. When this artistic sense was rapidly developing the rich antistrophic periods, and various

metres, with orchestric to expound them to the eye as well as to the ear—it may have been felt that these complicated forms were greater and more national than the simple songs of Sappho and Anacreon, however pathetic and beautiful these latter might be. So it came that Ibycus, who is quoted with great enthusiasm by Athenæus, and other critics of late date, is not, so far as I can remember, commonly praised among the ancients, or placed at all on a level with Stesichorus. To us the extant fragments justify the reversing of this judgment, those of Ibycus being exceptionally beautiful.¹

The legend of the cranes which exposed his murderers has been best told in a famous poem by Schiller, but does not rest on any very ancient authority.²

- ¹ Frag. 2 : Ἔρος αὐτέ με κυανέοισιν ὑπὸ βλεφάροισι τακέρ' ὄμμασι
 δερκόμενος
 κηλήμασι παντοδαποῖς ἐς ἄπειρα δίκτυα Κύπριδι βάλλει·
 ἧ μὰν τρομέω νιν ἐπερχόμενον,
 ὥστε φερέζυγος ἵππος ἀεθλοφόρος ποτὶ γήραι
 ἀέκων σὺν ὄχεσφι θοοῖς ἐς ἄμιλλαν ἔβα.

² Some grammarian brought the name together with ἰβυξ, probably a crane, and hence the legend arose. Cf. Flach, i. p. 602. Cf. also the list of obscure poets of the Dorian lyric school given in Flach, i. 321, *noto*. They are mere names, not worth recording here.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE AGE OF SIMONIDES AND PINDAR.

§ 148. WE come at last to the two great masters of what the Germans call *universal melic*, Simonides and Pindar. Universal melic implies that these men rose above all local idioms and parochial interests, and were acknowledged as national poets¹ and composers of all sorts of lyric poetry. It must, however, be remembered, in limitation of these notions, that the love-songs of the Æolic school are not reproduced, that the personal experiences of the poet are no longer prominent, and that these men distinctly represent the triumph of the public lyrics over the personal lyrics of earlier schools. This change was either the cause or the effect, or both, of a changed social position in the poets themselves. Neither Simonides nor Pindar has anything in common with the turbulent aristocrats of earlier lyric days. The rise and prevalence of tyrants in Greece, and their desire of spreading culture about them, had created a demand, and a comfortable prospect, for professional court poets, of whom Anacreon has already been noticed as a specimen. Thus both Simonides and Pindar lived and composed at the courts of tyrants. But fortunately for them their epoch coincided with the outburst of democracy after the Persian wars, and the rise of free states which could rival the tyrants in patronising letters. Thus we

¹ This claim is, however, made by an earlier poet, Echembrotus, the Arcadian; cf. above, p. 224. The dialect of both these poets in their choral songs was not their native tongue, but the conventional Doric dialect used by Stesichorus for this kind of poetry. Pindar, indeed, appears to have used some of his native Bœotisms, and Simonides in his elegiac poems his native Ionic, but in general their language was as fixed and as artificial as that of the odes in the Attic tragedy.

find these distinguished men equal favourites with despots and with their bitterest enemies, and we can see how carefully they must have avoided politics. In the great national contest against Persia, Simonides took part by his numerous elegies and epigrams,¹ for which he seems to have revived the elegiac metre, which had fallen into disuse for philosophical and moral purposes. But Pindar, whose city had taken the wrong side, and had Medized, was unable to glorify the Greek cause adequately at the expense of the Thebans, and hence Simonides maintained, among his contemporaries, a higher reputation.

SIMONIDES, son of Leoprepes, was born at Iulis, on the island of Keos—an island afterwards noted for good laws and for culture—and was consequently distinguished from his older namesake as *ὁ Κεῖος*. As his life reached from 556 to 469 B.C., he may be said to have lived through the most glorious and certainly the most eventful period of Greek history. In one department of poetry, in his elegies and epigrams, he indeed always held the foremost rank, but the sacerdotal and grandiloquent splendour of Pindar has long gained the day over the smoother and more worldly compositions of Simonides, which were more obvious and are believed to have been less profound. He wrote concerning Lycurgus, and his influence on Sparta, probably in some choral piece intended for recitation there. He was intimate with both Pausanias and Themistocles; he was long the favourite leader of the cyclic choruses (in spite of his plain appearance) and composer of dithyrambic hymns at the Dionysiac festivals, which had become popular since the days of Peisistratus. He was intimate with the Skopadæ, the hereditary grandees of Thessaly, who may have been far behind Athenian culture, but were able to pay princely fees for the praise even of their dogs. He was also intimate with the great tyrants in Sicily, with Theron and Hieron, whose quarrels he allayed by his prudent advice. It seems that anyone could purchase his services, and this purely professional attitude appeared mean to most Greeks when compared with the red-hot passion of the old aristocratic lyrist, or the national importance of the Attic dramatist, whose aims were far above pecuniary rewards.

¹ Fragg. 90-110.

Most unfortunately we have no complete poem (save epigrams and epitaphs) now remaining from this great master; but the exquisite beauty, the pellucid clearness, and the deep but chastened pathos of his fragments make us wish to exchange a few of Pindar's more laboured odes for the masterpieces of his rival. Besides sepulchral inscriptions, we have remains of Epinikia, of Hymns, Dithyrambs, Parthenia, Hyporchemes, and Threni, or laments. Our finest fragments belong to the latter, and lead us to suppose that pathos was the peculiar gift in which he excelled. It was that calm and dignified grief which is so marked a feature in the monumental art of the Greeks, and of which the specimens in sculpture reach from the Attic tomb reliefs to the famous Laocoon.

Simonides was, moreover, famed for wise and witty sayings, and paid attention to the art of mnemonics. His modifications of the Greek alphabet point rather to his having brought additional letters, already known, into fashion in monumental inscriptions, than to his being the actual discoverer. He described poetry as *word-painting*, a remark with which Lessing opens his *Laocoon*, and styles Simonides 'the Greek Voltaire,' a very unhappy comparison. Of the great number of epigrams handed down to us in the *Anthology* under his name, many are doubtless spurious, nor is it easy to detect a clever imitator in such short and simple pieces, where a far inferior poet might often succeed in rivalling his master.¹ Some of them, however, are attested by indubitable authority, such as that of Herodotus, or by respectable scholiasts. These are rather remarkable for extreme simplicity and for an avoidance of the conceits of later epigrammatists.² But in any case they are of inferior interest to the fragments of his greater poems, as, for example,

¹ Even if critics did not differ widely in their estimates. Thus the epigram on the slain at the Eurymedon (fr. 105)—in any case of doubtful authenticity on account of its date, which was about that of the poet's death at Syracuse—is considered by Krüger a poor imitation, by Bergk and Flach (i. p. 618) a noble poem of the best period.

² His high esteem for terse clear utterance, as a privilege of Greeks and of educated men, appears from the proverbs about his *μακρὸς λόγος* (cf. Bergk, frag. 189).

the exquisite *lament of Danae*.¹ The form of this poem is peculiar. It is no proper *threnos* on the death of a real person, but the poetical account of a pathetic mythical situation. It approaches the lyrical monody of a tragedy.

Apart from his splendid expressions of nationality and of patriotism,² there is, apparently for the reasons above cited, an avoidance of politics in the remains of Simonides. On the other hand, we find a considerable advance in the critical and philosophical temper which pervades them. He dissects and censures the current saws of elder sages,³ and sometimes repeats them in a finer and richer form. Thus Hesiod's famous lines on the 'narrow way that leadeth unto virtue'

- ¹ Frag. 37 : "Οτε λάρνακι ἐν δαιδαλέῳ ἀνεμός τέ μιν
 κινηθεῖσά τε λίμνα
 δείματι ἥριπεν, οὐκ ἀδιάντοισι παρειαιῖς
 ἀμφί τε Περσεῖ βάλλε φίλαν χέρα
 εἴπε τε· ὦ τέκος, οἶον ἔχω πόνον·
 σὺ δ' ἄωτεις γαλαθηνῶ τ' ἤθει κνώσσεις ἀτερπεῖ
 δώματι χαλκεογόμφῳ,
 νυκτιλαμπεῖ κυανέῳ τε δυνήῳ τανυσθείς.
 αὐαλέαν δ' ὕπερθε τεῶν κόμαν βαθεῖαν
 παριόντος κύματος οὐκ ἀλέγεις,
 οὐδ' ἀνέμου φθόγγων,
 κείμενος ἐν πορφυρέῳ χλανίδι, πρόσωπον καλόν.
 Εἰ δέ τοι δεινὸν τό γε δεινὸν ἦν,
 καὶ κεν ἐμῶν ρημάτων λεπτὸν ὑπεῖχες οὖας.
 κέλομαι δ' εὐδε βρέφος, εὐδέτω δὲ πόντος,
 εὐδέτω δ' ἔμετρον κακόν·
 μεττιβολία δέ τις φανείη, Ζεῦ πάτερ,
 ἐκ σέο· ὅττι δὲ θαρσαλέον ἔπος
 εὔχομαι, τεκνόφι δίκαν σύγγνωθί μοι.

- ² Frag. 4 : Τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων
 εὐκλεῆς μὲν ἂ τύχα, καλὸς δ' ὁ πότμος,
 βωμὸς δ' ὁ τάφος, πρὸ γούων δὲ μνᾶστις, ὃ δ' οἶκος ἔπαινος.
 ἐντάφιον δὲ τοιοῦτον εὐρώς
 οὐθ' ὃ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος.
 ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀγαθῶν ὅδε σακὸς οἰκέτιαν εὐδοξίαν
 'Ελλάδος εἴλετο· μαρτυρεῖ δὲ Λεωνίδας
 ὃ Σπάρτας βασιλεὺς, ἀρετᾶς μέγαν λελοιπῶς
 κόσμον ἀνάον τε κλειῖος.

³ See also among his *ἄτακτοι λόγοι*, or 'wit and wisdom,' the advice (frag. 192) *παίζειν ἐν τῷ βίῳ καὶ περὶ μὴ ἔν ἀπλῶς σπουδάζειν*.

are beautifully rendered.¹ But the leading feature in his philosophy seems a gentle and resigned fatalism, dwelling patiently on the weakness and the ills of men, and the inscrutable paths of Divine Providence.² The longer elegiac fragment (85) bears quite the stamp of Mimnermus, and may, as Bergk suggests, have strayed hither (through Stobæus) from the older Semonides. It seems a natural consequence of this fatalism, which is curiously at variance with the splendid speculations of Pindar on the future life of the blessed, that there should be passages in Simonides asserting the paramount importance of pleasure.³ His other rival in cyclic choruses was *Lasus* of Hermione, the teacher of Pindar, and one of the literary men employed at the court of Peisistratus, of whose works but a single fragment of three lines remains.

In concluding our account of these manifold fragments of Greek poetry between Hesiod and Pindar, it may be well to mention that English versions of the most striking pieces will be found appended to Milman's *Agamemnon*, to Mr. Fitzgerald's *Hippolytus*, and in the chapters which Mr. Symonds has devoted to them in his *Greek Poets*.

¹ Frag. 58 :

Ἔστι τις λόγος,
τὰν Ἀρετὰν ναίειν δυσαμβάτοισ ἐπὶ πέτραις,
νῦν δέ μιν θοὰν χῶρον ἀγνὸν ἀμφέπειν.
οὐδὲ πάντων βλεφάροις θνατῶν ἔσοπτος,
ᾧ μὴ δακέθυμος ἰδρῶς
ἔνδοθεν μόλῃ, ἵκηται τ' ἐς ἄκρον ἀνδρείας.

² Thus (frag. 38, 39) :

Πάντα γὰρ μίαν ἰκνεῖται δασπλήτα Χάρυβδιν,
αἱ μεγάλαι τ' ἀρεταὶ καὶ ὁ πλοῦτος.
Πολλὰς γὰρ ἄμμιν εἰς τὸ τεθνᾶναι χρόνος,
ζῶμεν δ' ἀριθμῶ παῦρα κακῶς ἔτεα.

And again :

Ἀνθρώπων ὀλίγον μὲν κάρτος, ἀπρακτοὶ δὲ μεληδόνες,
αἰῶνι δὲ παύρῃ πόνος ἀμφὶ πόνῳ.
ὁ δ' ἄφυκτος ὁμῶς ἐπικρέμαται θάνατος.
κείνου γὰρ ἴσον λάχον μέρος οἱ τ' ἀγαθοὶ
δοῖσι τε κακός.

³ As we have in frag. 70 and 71. His rivalry with Pindar and jealousy of him are said to have been expressed in the words of frag. 75, ἐξελέγχει ὁ νέος οἶνος, &c.

§ 149. The Theban Pindar is the only Greek lyric poet of whose works any considerable or complete portion has been preserved, and it is fortunate that even this scanty dole should come from an artist of the highest name and fame. He was born at Cynoscephalæ, close to Thebes, the son of Daiphantus, in the spring of 521, or end of Ol. 64, 3.¹ His ancestors were known as flute-players, and apparently connected, through the Ægidæ, with Doric blood, as we may infer from his 5th Pythian ode. Lasus of Hermione was his master,² and indeed Thebes was generally celebrated at the time for flute-playing,³ though an old proverb, which he twice quotes, spoke of his people as 'Bœotian swine.' Yet celebrated women, Myrtis and Corinna, contended against him and conquered him in his early youth in poetical contests, and from the latter he is said to have received advice and encouragement. But he became known and esteemed at an early age, for we have one poem (*Pyth.* x.) apparently written when he was not above twenty. Two others (*Pyth.* vi. and xii.), which date from before the Persian wars, are simpler and less ambitious than his later poems, and may be regarded as showing the earliest phase of Pindar's style. The great crisis of the Persian wars seems to have affected him as little as was possible, for being a Theban and opposed to the patriotic states of Greece, he could not offend

¹ He was certainly born at the very time of the 17th Pythian Games, but there is a grave doubt whether this may not correspond with Ol. 65, 3 (518 B.C.), for though the Pythian contest seems to have originated in the 48th Ol., the first contest was an ἀγὼν χρηματίας, for money prizes, whereas in Ol. 49, 3 it was made στεφανίτης, and from this date the scholiasts on Pindar begin their reckoning. Boeckh, who counts from Ol. 48, 4, depends on Pausanias only, who seems hardly so good an authority as the excellent scholiasts on Pindar. Cf. on the question Bergk, *FLG.* p. 9, who says he probably lost his father early, and that his step-father Scopelinus was a flute-player. There is now an excellent and ample monograph on Pindar by A. Croiset (*La Poésie de Pindare*, second edition, 1886).

² Apollodorus and Agathocles are also mentioned, and it is more than probable that he received his instruction from all three masters at Athens.

³ This fashion was not introduced at Athens till later, and is mentioned in connection with Alcibiades.

his townsmen, and would not offend the greater states with whom his sympathy probably lay. Polybius, indeed (iv. 31), censures him for his 'most disgraceful and mischievous utterance' in favour of the Thebans keeping aloof from the great national conflict with Persia, on the plea of peace at any price. From this time on he was employed writing occasional poems for the kings or citizens of various Hellenic cities, and it seems almost certain, from his allusions, that he visited Thessaly, Ægina, Argos, and, of course, Delphi and Olympia. He probably knew all the great cities; but wrote very little for Athenians, and not at all (I believe) for Sparta. He went to visit Hieron at Syracuse in Ol. 76 or 77, and made friends in most of the Sicilian cities, but seems to have been annoyed at the rivalry and fame of Simonides and Bacchylides. Thus he may fairly be called a national lyric poet, and one who was honoured and rewarded by all manner of Hellenes alike. The end of his life was without incident; he died in his eightieth year at the Bœotian Argos (441 B.C.).¹ There was a bronze statue erected to him at Athens, and he was specially paid by the Athenians for one of his poems. His house was spared by Alexander when destroying Thebes. He had the character of a pious reserved man, specially devoted to the worship of Apollo among the gods, and learned in the myths and ceremonies of local cults. He often gave proverbial advice like the older elegiasts, to whose tone and style his wisdom bears much resemblance. A closer estimate of his genius will occupy us presently.

His poems comprised Hymns, Pæans, Prosodia (of which two remain among our collection), Parthenia, Hyporchemes, Encomia, Skolia, Dithyrambs (of which one considerable frag-

¹ Other authorities place his death in his sixty-sixth year (Ol. 82, 1). That the obscure Argos, mentioned as the birthplace of Acusilaus, is intended, seems likely from the other account, which speaks of him as dying in his own country. Four lives of Pindar from Suidas, the MSS. and elsewhere, were collected by Boeckh, and are copied from him into later editions. A fifth is prefixed to the Teubner text (ed. Christ). The fullest and best seems to be that in a Breslau MS. (Vratisl. A, which also contains the best scholia), which was first edited by Schneider.

ment remains), Threni,¹ which seem to have been exceptionally fine, and the Epinikia, or hymns of victory, which form the chief part of the poems we possess. I do not believe the notice in Suidas that he wrote tragedies. For the theory that there existed lyrical tragedies, intermediate between the choral lyrics and the Attic tragedy, though sustained by Böckh and O. Müller, seems devoid of any better foundation than that grammarian's notice.

§ 150. The general features of all these varied poems may be gathered up under the following heads. In the first place, they were *non-political*. The poet seems to have carefully avoided identifying himself with any party or form of government. His patrons were sometimes free aristocrats, sometimes hereditary rulers, sometimes tyrants ; and the poet is willing for pay to praise the good points in all of them. Secondly, they are *religious*, and here a strong feature in the man shines through every line that he wrote. He was honestly attached to the national religion, and to its varieties in old local cults. He lived a somewhat sacerdotal life, labouring in honour of the gods, and seeking to spread a reverence for old traditional beliefs. He, moreover, shows an acquaintance with Orphic rites and Pythagorean mysteries, which led him to preach the doctrine of immortality, and of rewards and punishments in the life hereafter.² This striking feature was not generally adopted by later moral teachers, and shows that the religious teaching of Pindar had no lasting effect on the nation. Thirdly, the poems of Pindar are *learned*, and learned in this particular sense, that while he repudiates the newer philosophy, he lays

¹ Suidas gives seventeen separate titles for the seventeen books, if we omit the tragedies. The author of his life in some of the MSS. has only eight titles, giving two or more books under some of them. From the fact that Theophrastus, Aristoxenus, and other old authorities quote from the *skolia*, which do not appear in the second list, Bergk (*FLG.* pp. 280, sq.) infers that there was an old Attic collection in seventeen books, which Suidas' authority knew ; and that the more systematic list, reduced under fewer heads, was the Alexandrian recension, probably first edited by Aristophanes.

² The most explicit fragment (*θρηνοι*, 3) is, however, not considered genuine by recent critics.

great stress on mythical histories, on genealogies, and on ritual. He is indeed more affected by the advance of freethinking than he imagines: he borrows from the neologians the habit of rationalising myths, and explaining away immoral acts and motives in the gods; but these things are isolated attempts with him, and have no deep effect upon his general thinking. Fourthly, they are *stately*, often grandiloquent, often obscure, but never smooth or witty, never playful with success, but striking from their splendid diction and strange imagery. The extant odes are exceedingly difficult, not as the choruses of Æschylus are difficult, from an inability to compass sublime thoughts with words, but from the involved constructions, the inverted order, and the imperfect logic of his long and complicated sentences. Possibly the requirements of his elaborate metres may have further increased these difficulties. And yet Eustathius tells us that these Epinikia were more popular than his other works.¹ If this be so, what must the other poems have been? for the extant odes teem with myths, often local and obscure, myths of little interest, and full of difficulty.

Nevertheless, it is certain that Pindar has kept his place as the very highest and noblest representative of Greek lyric poetry. He was honoured and courted all over Greece. One of his poems was inscribed on a stele in the temple of Jupiter Ammon at Thebes.² The Athenians certainly set up a statue in his honour, and are said (in a letter of the pseudo-Æschines) to have paid him double the fine imposed upon him by the Thebans for calling Athens the mainstay of Greece,³ as well as for calling Athens *the glorious* (λιπαραί). These silly stories represent both Athens and Thebes as infinitely more childish than we know them to have been. As for calling Athens λιπαραί, the epithet is applied in his extant remains to Mara-

¹ διὰ τὸ ἀνθρωπικώτεροι εἶναι καὶ ὀλιγόμυθοι, καὶ μὴδὲ πᾶν ἔχειν ἀσαφῶς κατὰ γὰρ τὰ ἄλλα.

² Paus. ix. 16 1

³ ἔρεϊσμα Ἑλλάδος. I ask the reader to observe the growth of the story. Isocrates (*Antidosis*, § 166) merely says that for the sake of the one phrase the Athenians made him a proxenus, with a present of 10,000 drachmæ: the later letter embellishes the matter.

thon, Orchomenus, Naxos, Smyrna, Egypt, and Thebes; nor do I think the story anything but a scholiast's invention *à propos* of a well-known passage in Aristophanes.¹ As for the Thebans fining a professional poet for praising his patrons, I cannot believe such an absurdity. Pindar was quite ready to praise tyrants, to praise democracies, to praise Dorians, with whom he felt special sympathies, to praise Ionians, and he did this professionally and for pay.² He was a good friend of all parties, a religious and respectable man, and hated nobody except rival poets, at whom he is always sneering, and philosophers, who were becoming serious rivals to the poets generally, as teachers of morals and expounders of nascent science. These two classes of people Pindar is constantly attacking; he is constantly asserting his own powers and achievements against them in a rather undignified way—in fact, the personal allusions in Pindar's poems are not at all pleasant or in good taste.

But as my own judgment of Pindar is somewhat at variance with that of most classical scholars, I advise the reader to turn to the texts themselves, and decide for himself.³ Apart from

¹ *Acharn.* 636.

² He alludes feelingly to this lower condition of this muse, as compared with the older lyric poets, in *Isthm.* ii. 6, et sqq.

ἂ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδὴς πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις·
οὐδ' ἐπερνάντο γλυκεῖαι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας
ἄργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι αἰοδαί.
νῦν δ' ἐφίητι τὸ τῶργείου φυλάξαι
ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας ὁδῶν ἑγχίστα βαῖνον,
χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνὴρ, ὃς φᾶ κτεάνων θαμὰ λειφθεὶς
καὶ φίλων.

³ He may also consult Croiset's excellent book, *La Poésie de Pindare*, to me, however, too much a mere panegyric. He has repeated most of the substance in his chapter (vii.) on Pindar in the second vol. of his *Greek Literature*. On the other hand Wilamowitz, a great authority, in his brilliant sketch of the course of lyric poetry, seems to feel as I do. 'The poet is an imposing figure: but this kind of poetry, where the narrative in conventional style is coupled with intolerable enumerations of earlier prizes, compliments to trainers and grooms, and what is true individual poetry is confined to narrow limits—this is the questionable product of a *Mischkultur*, developed in a society that has outlived its proper life, and bears the stamp of decay' (*Herakles*, i. 104)

exceptional compositions, like that above alluded to as inscribed on stone, Pindar's works, being all occasional and special, soon passed out of note, and were forgotten by the masses. He was not a patriotic poet, in the larger Hellenic sense. He wrote little even for the greater Greek states, Sparta and Athens. Above all, he appeared at the close of the lyric epoch, and at the season when his contemporary Æschylus had found a newer and better way of touching public sympathy. So Pindar came to be 'silenced by the want of taste in the public,' as an early comic poet says. Yet Plato often quotes him with respect, and we may feel sure that he at no time wanted readers.

§ 151. But when the learned men of Alexandria began studying old Greek poetry, and analysing and explaining myths, Pindar was a welcome and much-prized field for research. To such poets as Apollonius Rhodius, who revelled in mythological lore, Pindar's accounts of the local genealogies and legends afforded endless material, and so we find full and excellent scholia upon his works. We have ninety quotations from him in Plutarch, who specially studied and prized him for patriotic reasons, as he was the greatest of Boeotian poets—a very small class in Greek literature. The Romans, who took most of their opinions about Greek literature from the Alexandrians, esteemed Pindar very highly, and Horace speaks constantly of him in terms of the most extravagant praise. His metres were, of course, impossible to reproduce for mere readers like the Romans, and Horace saw well (what some obscurer Romans failed to see) that any attempt at imitating the rich and complicated systems of Pindar's verse would be ridiculous. In fact, without *orchestic*, without the rythmical motions of a chorus, of which the figures corresponded to the strophes of the odes, such vast and intricate structures are perfectly incomprehensible. Anyone who questions this may study the whole subject in the learned essays of Boeckh's edition, and in the discussions of Von Leutsch, and of Westphal and Rossbach.

I pass the metrical questions by in this history as unsuited to a handbook of Greek literature.

But I may not omit to mention one curious theory propounded as regards his odes, in connection with those of Æschylus, by R. Westphal (*Prolegg. zu Æsch. Trag.* 1869). This theory has been further expanded and strongly asserted in the case of Pindar by Mezger in his German Commentary on Pindar (Leipzig, 1880). It has received very little attention in Germany, none in England till the former edition of this book, and is nevertheless well worthy of further examination. Westphal asserts that both Pindar and Æschylus (discounting his amœbean *commoi*) composed their odes on the plan of the Terpendrian nome (cf. p. 187). If so, the full form of the ode was as follows: first, a *προοίμιον* (or *ἐπαρχά*), passing into the *ἀρχά* (*μεταρχά* of Pollux). This was followed by the *κατατροπά*, which introduced, as a transition piece, the *ὀμφαλός* or main body of the hymn, in which (in Pindar's case) we always find a mythical narrative. A second transition, the *μετακατατροπά*, corresponding closely to the *κατατροπά*, leads to the *σφραγίς*, and the ode ends with the *ἐπίλογος*. Pindar occupies his *ἀρχά* and *σφραγίς* with the praise of the victor and his family, and the transition movements contain some personal remark, often repeating the same metaphor, and *in the same words*, by way of index.¹ Thus the full Pindaric or Æschylean ode might be compared in its grouping to that of the pediments of the Greek temples, which decrease symmetrically, so that the several members correspond according to their respective distances from the great figures in the centre. The correspondences of Greek art dispose us to consider this attractive theory very seriously, especially as both Pindar and Æschylus certainly do not bind themselves (like Euripides and Sophocles) to the divisions of strophe and antistrophe in the *matter* of their odes. The end of a strophe is often with them no halting-point in either the construction or the sense.

¹ Cf. the varying view of Bergk (*L. G.* ii. 213, note), who cites a hymn of Callimachus as an illustration. Sittl (*L. G.* 290) allows the application to Æschylus, but not to Pindar. A. Croiset (*Poésie de Pindare*, p. 126) rejects it altogether. Mr. Bury (in his ed. of the Nem. and Isth. Odes, 1890) shows that while the suggesting words which mark a transition are even more frequent than Mezger supposes, his theory will not fit into the facts.

But if this was more than a mere license, if it was a principle to divide their odes differently, is it not strange that they should universally have adopted a strophic form calculated to mislead and bewilder the hearer? Why should the rythm of the figures of the dance have violated the deeper meaning of the poem? This appears to me an unanswered difficulty,¹ though it is quite true that the later poets were far more obedient to the form indicated by responsive verses. In addition to this formal objection, it may be argued against Mezger, in the case of Pindar, that the members do not correspond in length, the ἀρχά and σφραγίς, for example, being seldom of equal compass. This is a serious objection in a symmetrical work of art, whose very beauty consists in its symmetry. Lastly, when we come to Mezger's analysis of individual odes, we find the seven members hardly ever clearly marked, and in most of them some subordinate member is omitted. These mutually corroborative objections are decisive against accepting the theory without further support, even if the speculations he hazards on the central thought of each ode were not as vague and uncertain as those of his predecessors. The strength of the theory is best seen in Ol. vi., where his division happens nearly to coincide with the strophic arrangement, viz. προοίμ., 1-7; ἀρχά, 8-21; καταρχά, 22-8; ὀμφαλός, 29-70; μετακατ., 71-7; σφραγίς, 78-100; ἐπίλογ., 100-5.

§ 152. As to the structure of the odes of Pindar in the way of *argument*, a curious revolution of opinion has taken place. The Greek scholiasts seem, from various hints, to have thought that the many sudden changes, the many covert allusions, and interrupted digressions in the odes are due to some fixed plan in the poet's mind. But the Romans and the general public, from that day onward, rather looked upon him as an intoxicated bard, whose poetic fervour carried him along (as he himself often pretends) by a sort of inspiration alien

¹ Flach (*Gesch. d. griech. Lyrik*, i. 299) discusses this change of form from *nomic* to *strophic*, and attributes it to the desire to *simplify* the music and rythms for a dancing chorus, which could not be so perfect as the single virtuoso. But this seems hardly an adequate reason.

to the laws of sober argument. This opinion prevailed till the present century, when the Germans have revived the old theory with great exaggeration, and have endeavoured to show that each ode is based on one central idea, and that there is not a single clause without special reference to, and a logical nexus with, the leading idea of the poem. Boeckh, Hermann, Dissen, Rauchenstein, Schneidewin, and others, have ridden this theory to death, and nothing can be more unpoetical than their lumbering importation of beauties into Pindar. Westphal's Terpandrian theory is far the best. Nevertheless, it is certain that the circumstances of the victory, or of the victor, constantly suggested to Pindar casual and transient allusions, of which the point has now been lost. Thus, much of his apparent obscurity or irrelevancy has arisen from the *speciality* of his compositions. We must also remember that the introduction of local myths, to us wearisome, was another feature specially pleasing to the hearers of the poems.

An ingenious French critic, Havet, has shown great general resemblances between the stately lyrics of Pindar and the stately orations of Isocrates. The main object of both was *epideictic*, that is, both encomiastic in subject and elaborate in form. The complicated strophes of the poet may have even directly suggested the elaborate periods of the sophist. It is also to be noted that neither of them touches the heart, though they astonish the reason and fire the imagination; both were too artificial for that deepest of all functions in great poetry and oratory. In both, again, we may admire the consummate skill with which they manage their transitions from one topic to another: Pindar, as I have explained already, with long-concealed art; Isocrates with ever-praised and admired invention. On the whole, we may say of Pindar that he is so intensely Greek as to have lost much of his beauty by transference from his native soil and society; and, again, that his work was so strictly special and occasional that, of all the great poets left to us, he suffers most by being removed from his own time and circumstances. Taking all these things into account, and, moreover, that he worked for pay, his lasting and deserved reputation is perhaps the most wonderful tribute to Greek genius.

§ 153. The extant *Epinikia* of Pindar are divided into four books, determined (without strict accuracy) by the feasts at which the victories they celebrate were won, viz. Olympian, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian odes :¹ the three last Nemean, the 2nd Pythian, and perhaps others, were intended for other occasions. None of these poems has had its authenticity questioned except the 5th Olympian, for metrical reasons, as it approaches in structure to the Æolic school ; and it is remarkable that as soon as the critics doubted its genuineness they immediately discovered that it was feeble and unpoetical, and unworthy of Pindar's greatness. I have no doubt that many of Pindar's poems, were they taken from under the ægis of his name, would suffer the same injustice.

The rhythms are divided into Dorian, Æolian, and Lydian ; and the researches of the commentators have pointed out that the Dorian are chiefly dactyls and trochaic dipodies, giving a slower and more solemn movement, with which the tenor of these odes corresponds. The Æolian and Lydian are lighter in character, and the latter specially used in plaintive subjects. Why the metres should vary with the quality of the scales employed is a matter for which we can now see no solid reason, and, indeed, we are told that Dorian melody might be set, and was set by Pindar, to an Æolian accompaniment. The odes are generally strophic and antistrophic, and meant for a marching or dancing chorus, which stood still when epodes were added. Some were performed at Olympia, after the victory ; some at the victor's home, far away, and even a long time after the victory had been gained.

The general treatment of the subject shows that Pindar was expected to make the rejoicing a public one, reflecting on the whole clan and ancestry of the victor ; still more on his city, and on its tutelary heroes. Thus the poet conforms to the general law of Greek art, which ordained that it should be public, and not confined to private interests or private appreciation.

¹ There were at this period innumerable athletic and musical contests throughout Greece, but the four specified were the most celebrated, and national.

He usually starts from the mythical splendours of the victor's family or city, selects such points in their history as have some practical lesson bearing upon the present circumstances of his hearers, and insists upon the importance of inborn qualities and high traditions. Such a line of argument was, of course, peculiarly meant for aristocrats. He then passes to the victor's family, enumerates any prizes gained by his relations, and ends with some sort of summary or moral reflection.

This general sketch is, however, so much varied, that it must be regarded only as the vaguest description of Pindar's odes. In some, such as the 4th Pythian, the longest and most important of those extant, an account of the adventures of the Argonauts, in relation to Thera and Cyrene, is developed at almost epical length; in others, such as the two odes addressed to Athenians,¹ the mythical narrative is left out. But the Athenians, being at this time poor, and doubtless devoted to higher objects than athletics, come in for little share of Pindar's praise. The wealthy mercantile Æginetans, on the contrary, and the luxurious Sicilians (especially the tyrants) occupy a very large place in his poetry. He must have been a peculiar favourite with both, for fifteen odes celebrate Sicilian, and eleven Æginetan victors. At Nemea especially, which was very close to them, the Æginetans contended with great success.

§ 154. If we proceed to consider the extant poems and fragments more specially, we find that the Olympian odes are, perhaps, the most splendid, not only as celebrating victories in the greatest Greek games, but as being composed for great personages, and probably most splendidly rewarded. The Pythian are more difficult, and replete with mythical lore, on account of Pindar's close connection with the worship of Apollo, and his probable intimacy with the colleges of priests at Delphi. About half the odes, in both cases, are for victors with chariots or mule-cars; both of which implied wealthy owners, such as the Sicilian or Cyrenæan tyrants. The narrative of the birth of Iamus,² the opening of the 12th, and the 14th Olympian odes, seem to me particularly fine.

¹ *Pyth.* vii., *Nem.* ii.

² *Ol.* vi. 25, sq.

The last, being a short and very perfect specimen of Pindar's excellence, may here be quoted.¹

Among the Pythian, the opening of the first is splendid²

¹ Καφισίων ὑδάτων λαχοῖ-
 σαι αἶ τε ναίετε καλλίπῳλον ἔ-
 δραν, ᾧ λιπαρᾶς ἀοίδιμοι βασίλειαι
 Χάριτες Ὀρχομενοῦ,
 παλαιγόνων Μινυᾶν ἐπίσκοποι,
 κλῦτ', ἐπεὶ εὖχομαι.
 σὺν γὰρ ὑμῖν τὰ τερπνὰ καὶ τὰ γλυκέα
 γίνεταί πάντα βροτοῖς·
 εἰ σοφός, εἰ καλός, εἴ τις ἀγλαὸς
 ἀνὴρ. οὔτε γὰρ θεοὶ
 σεμνᾶν Χαρίτων ἕτερ
 κοιρανέοντι χοροῦς,
 οὔτε δαίτας· ἀλλὰ πάντων
 ταμίαι ἔργων ἐν οὐρανῳ,
 Χρυσότοξον θέμεναι
 παρὰ Πύθιον Ἀπόλλωνα θρόνους,
 ἰέναον σέβοντι πατρὸς
 Ὀλυμπίοιο τιμάν.
 Πότνι' Ἀγλαΐα, φιλησέμολπε
 τ' Εὐφροσύνα, θεῶν κρατίστου παῖδες,
 ἐπάκοι νῦν, Θαλία τε ἐ-
 ρασέμολπε, ἰδοῖσα τόνδε
 κῶμον ἐπ' εὐμενεὶ τύχῃ
 κοῦφα βιβῶντα· Λυδῖφ γὰρ
 Ἀσώπιχον ἐν τρόπῳ
 ἐν μελέταις τε αἰείδων
 μόλον· οὔνεκ' Ὀλυμπιόνικος ἂ Μινύεια
 σεῦ ἔκατι. Μελαντειχέα νῦν δόμον
 Φερσεφόνας ἴθι, Ἀχοῖ,
 πατρὶ κλυτὰν φέροισ' ἄγ-
 γελίαν, Κλεῦδαμον ὄφρα ἰδοῖς' υἱ-
 ὸν εἴπῃς ὅτι οἱ νέαν
 κόλποις παρ' εὐδόξου Πίσας
 ἔστεφάνωσε κυδῖμων ἀέθλων
 πτεροῖσι χαίταν.

² Χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλω-
 νος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων
 σὺνδίκον Μοισᾶν κτέανον·
 τᾶς ἀκούει μὲν βάσις, ἀγλαΐας ἀρχά,
 πείθονται δ' ἀοιδοὶ σάμασιν,

There is a very picturesque narrative of the youth and adventures of the nymph Cyrene in the 9th.¹ The Nemean (with their appendix) and the Isthmian, though not less difficult, are, I think, less striking, both in general elevation and also in those peculiar beauties which I have pointed out in the Olympian and Pythian odes.

§ 155. The fragments left to us are very numerous (more than 300), and very various in form and style. Perhaps foremost in interest are the *θρήνοι*, or *funeral laments*, in which Pindar was wont to preach the purer doctrines either of the Pythagoreans, or of the Orphic and other mysteries. The first three fragments transmitted to us under this head support the famous passage in the 2nd Olympian ode,² in which this new hope, and this higher aspiration, are set forth with no faltering tongue. But it is not a little remarkable that in other poems—the 1st Olympian and 5th Pythian³—the older, or, perhaps, the more general view of the state of the dead is maintained, and we have here the doctrine of Æschylus preached, which is quite distinct from the more modern view. Accordingly the most explicit fragment in the new doctrine (fr. 100) is declared spurious by the best recent critics.⁴ From his *Dithyrambs* we have a fine passage, written for one of the Dionysiac feasts at Athens, and preserved by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The metre is remarkable for the frequent resolutions of long syllables, so

ἀγησιχόρων ὀπότεν τῶν φροιμίων
 ἀμβολὰς τεύχης ἐλελίζομένα.
 καὶ τὸν αἵματὰν κεραυνὸν σβεννύεις
 ἀενάου πυρός. εὔ-
 δει δ' ἀνὰ σκάπτῳ Διὸς αἰετός, ὦ-
 κείαν πτέρυγ' ἀμφοτέρω-
 θεν χαλάξαις,
 ἀρχὸς οἰωνῶν, κελαινῶ-
 πιν δ' ἐπὶ οἱ νεφέλων
 ἀγκύλῳ κρατὶ, γλεφάρων
 ἄδῦ κλαῖστρον, κατέχευας • ὃ δὲ κνώσσω
 ὕγρον νῶτον αἰωρεῖ, τεαῖς
 ῥιπαῖσι κατασχόμενος.

¹ vv. 14, sq.

² vv. 56, sq.

³ vv. 85, sq.

⁴ Zeller, *Phil. der Griechen*, i. p. 56, note.

giving a peculiarly rapid effect. The same critic has preserved another poem of similar character, a hyporcheme composed for the Thebans, which treats of a recent eclipse of the sun (probably April 30, 463 B.C.), and which in diction and style reminds us strongly of some of the choral odes in the tragedies, especially those of Sophocles.¹

I will close these details with a word about Pindar's *skolia*. His ponderous and splendid style was not suited to light or frivolous subjects, and we can note, even in the scanty remains, a great contrast to the more favourite *skolia* of other poets. In fact, Pindar's lighter effusions seem to differ only in subject, not in style, from his solemn odes; and the prominent subject in the *skolia* seems to have been love. The first was composed for a chorus of 100 *ἐταῖραι*, whom the Corinthian Xenophon offered to bring to the temple of Aphrodite, to obtain the goddess' favour for an Olympic competition. The poet excuses the trade of these women on the ground of necessity, but in another fragment apologises for appearing at Corinth in connection with such company. This poem, which was composed in his best style, shows how completely professional his

¹ 'Ακτὶς Ἀελίου, τί πολύσκοπε μηδομένα, μήτερ

ὀμμάτων;

ἄστρον ὑπέρτατον ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κλεπτόμενον,

ἔθηκας ἀμάχανον ἰσχὺν ποτανὸν

ἀνδράσι καὶ σοφίας ὁδόν, ἐπίσκοτον

ἄτραπὸν ἐσσυμένα

ἐλαύνειν τι νεώτερον ἢ πάρος;

ἀλλὰ σε πρὸς Διὸς ἵπποις θοαῖς ἵκετεύω,

ἀπήμον' ἐς ὕλβον τράποις Θήβαις,

ὦ πότνια, πάγκοινον τέρας.

πολέμου δ' εἰ σᾶμα φέρεις τινός, ἢ στάσιν

οὐλομένην,

ἢ παγετὸν καρποῦ φθίσιν, ἢ νιφετοῦ σθένος

ὑπέρφατον,

ἢ πῆλτου κενέωσιν ἀνὰ πέδον

χθονός, ἢ νότιον θέρος,

ὕδατι ζακότῃ διερόν,

εἰ γαῖαν κατακλύσαισα θήσεις

ἀνδρῶν νέον ἐξ ἀρχῆς γένος,

ὀλοφύρομαι οὐδὲν ὅ τι πάντων μετὰ πείσομαι.

work was. and how little his moral saws need be taken as evidences of a lofty character. The second *skolion* in the modern collections is addressed to Theoxenus of Tenedos, a boy whom the poet loved passionately in his old age. Indeed, this Greek form of the passion is prominent enough all through his works, as we should expect from a Theban poet, and we find it in other scraps of his *skolia*.

I have already spoken of his philosophy. If in religion he shows great advance beyond earlier lyric and elegiac poets, this is probably to be attributed to the influences of the Delphic priesthood. In politics his opinions are not valuable, because they were accommodated to the views of his patrons. In morals he expresses the average feelings of the Greeks of his day ; while he is sometimes raised above them by his lofty conceptions of the unity and power of God, he often preaches the suspicion, the jealousy, and the selfishness which we find in Theognis. The resignation which he constantly inculcates is based on the same gentle fatalism which meets us in the consolations of Simonides.

§ 156. *Bibliographical.* I turn to the MSS., editions, and translations of note. We know that the greatest of the Alexandrians expended critical care on Pindar ; and the notes of Zenodotus and Aristarchus, with others, were put together by the indefatigable Didymus into a commentary, from which our best sets of scholia are excerpts. Other Byzantine scholars added inferior work. The commentary of Eustathius is lost all but the preface.

As to our extant MSS., Tycho Mommsen has established several families, and has collated a vast number of copies under each. The oldest and best are the Ambrosian C, 122, of the 12th cent. (called by him A) ; the MS. of Ursini in the Vatican (No. 1312), called B ; and a Medicean of the thirteenth century—all furnished with scholia. These older MSS. are far better than the Thomani or Moschopulei. The earliest edition was the Aldine of 1513, followed by Calergi's (Rome) in 1515 ; then Stephanus (1560 and 1599) ; Erasmus Schmid (1616) ; an Oxford edition by West and Walsted in 1697. Modern studies began with Heyne's great book (1778, and

reprinted) ; then A. Boeckh's monumental work (1811-22), supplemented by G. Hermann's notes, and Dissen and Schneidewin's elaborate commentary. The latest texts in Germany are Bergk's (in his *Lyrici*), and the exhaustive critical edition of Tycho Mommsen (Berlin, 1864), who first ordered and classified the legion of MSS. In England we have three good recent editions : Donaldson's (1841), a careful and scholarly work ; Cookesley's (Eton, 1852) ; and the third by Mr. C. A. M. Fennell (Cambridge University Series, 1879-83) ; Professor Gildersleeve has produced another in America. These, together with H. Bindseil's elaborate Concordance (Berlin, 1875), are quite adequate for the study of this difficult poet. We may now add Mezger's Commentary (Leipzig, 1880), and Rumpel's Lexicon (1883) ; lastly, Mr. J. B. Bury's remarkable edition of the *Nemean Odes*. The scholia, enriched by some recent discoveries in Patmos, are being critically edited by Abel (Berlin, 1884 ; the third part of the work, Berlin, 1890).

The translations of Pindar form a whole library, and are remarkable for having so many important prose versions among them. The earliest, in Latin verses, by Sudorius (in 1575), was followed in Germany by Damm (prose), 1771 ; then by Bothe, Thiersch, Hartung, Tycho Mommsen, W. Humboldt, and Donner, all weighty names. The Italians had a full text and Italian verse translation with notes, by G. Gautier, in four vols., a handsome work (Rome, 1762-8) ; and since, Borghi (1824). Our own Cowley, approaching the study of Pindar about 1650, speaks very severely of the extant translations, and, indeed, of the very attempt to render him into literal prose. 'If a man,' says he, 'would undertake to translate Pindar word for word, it would be thought that one madman had translated another, as may appear when he that understands not the original reads the verbal translations of him into Latin prose, than which nothing seems more raving ; and sure rhyme, without the addition of wit and the spirit of poetry, would but make it ten times more distracted.' The English Pindar, Virgil, and Horace, as he is called in his fulsome epitaph, proceeds to give specimens of

loose versions of two 'Pindarique odes' ¹—so loose that all the Pindar vanishes, and only Cowley remains. Gilbert West made a version in 1749; there was an Oxford prose translation in 1824; then very beautiful paraphrases by Bishop Heber in 1840, and a highly praised version of A. Moore (with Turner's prose, Bohn, 1852). We have also Wheelwright (1830), Cary (1833), Tremmenheere (1866), with a good preface, and omitting the mythical narratives, except in summary; also T. C. Baring (1875), into irregular rhymed verse; Frank D. Morice (1876, *Ol.* and *Pyth.* only); and an anonymous version (Winchester, 1876). Lastly, there are the new prose versions by Mr. Paley and Mr. Ernest Myers (1874), the latter of peculiar merit. Almost all these translations are enriched with dissertations on Pindar's genius, on the Olympic games, and on the difficulties of translating choral lyric odes into English. Their laudations of Pindar are, I think, indiscriminate; but I am bound to say that they show a general agreement against the view I have taken of the poet's position in his age.

§ 157. The other rival of Pindar's mature life was the nephew of Simonides, BACCHYLIDES of Keos, son of Meidon, or Meidylus. He lived with his uncle at the court of Hiero, and flourished about the 70th to 80th Olympiads. The scholiasts on Pindar tell us constantly ² of the jealousy of Pindar, and even of the preference shown to Bacchylides. His art, and the subjects he treated, seem quite similar to those of Simonides and Pindar; but it has been the modern fashion, following the judgment of Longinus, and of Longinus only, to describe him as a man of no genius, who by careful study and great correctness attained a moderate position, and never rose to real fame. There is no doubt that he was not equal to either of his great contemporaries, but the extant fragments show that later criticism has underrated the man. Had they been attributed to the greater poets, many of the critics who now barely condescend to approve of them would have been full of enthusiasm about them. It should be noticed particularly that the ideas developed in the few extant fragments seem copied

¹ *Ol.* ii. and *Nem.* i.

² On *Ol.* ii. 154, *Pyth.* ii. 97, 161-7, *Nem.* iii. 143.

by the greatest writers of the next generation. Thus the second and third

Θνατοῖσι μὴ φῦναι φέριστον,
μηδ' ἀελίου προσιδεῖν φέγγος·
ἔλβιος δ' οὐδεὶς βροτῶν πάντα χρόνον.

Παύροισι δὲ θνατῶν τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον
δαίμων ἔδωκεν
πράσσοντας ἐν καιρῷ πολιοκρόταφον
γῆρας ἱκνεῖσθαι, πρὶν ἐγκύρσαι δῦα.

contain the substance and almost the words of the famous chorus in Sophocles' second *Œdipus*, and the no less splendid prose paraphrase in Herodotus.¹ The beautiful *ῥαεα* on peace has more than one parallel in the choruses of Euripides :—

Τίτκει δέ τε θνατοῖσιν Εἰράνα μεγάλα
πλοῦτον καὶ μελιγλώσσων αἰοιδᾶν ἄνθεα,
δαιδαλέων τ' ἐπὶ βωμῶν θεοῖσιν αἰθεσθαι βοῶν
ξανθᾷ φλογὶ μῆρα τανυτρίχων τε μήλων,
γυμνασίων τε νέοις αὐλῶν τε καὶ κώμων μέλειν.
ἐν δὲ σιδαροδέτοις πόρπαξιν αἰθᾶν
ἀραχνᾶν ἴστωι πέλονται·
ἔγχεά τε λογχωτὰ ξίφεά τ' ἀμφάκεα δάμναται εὐρώς·
χαλκεᾶν δ' οὐκ ἔστι σαλπίγγων κτύπος·
οὐδὲ συλᾶται μελίφρων ὕπνος ἀπὸ γλεφάρων,
ἄμὸν δὲ θάλπει κέαρ.
συμποσίων δ' ἐρατῶν βριθοντ' ἀγυιαί παιδικοὶ θ' ὕμνοι
φλέγονται.

It is surprising that great German critics should depreciate this beautiful fragment, and call it a mere correct school-exercise ; but as I have quoted it in full, the reader may judge the matter for himself. A good many lines of erotic *skolia* are also extant, which appear to approach much nearer to the *Æolic* metres and style than the *skolia* of Pindar. He also composed choral drinking-songs, which can hardly be called *skolia*, but show a tendency to fuse styles, not uncommon at this epoch. On the whole, then, Bacchylides seems hardly to have received justice, if the extant pieces are not far above his average performance.

¹ O. C. v. 1211 ; Herod. vii. 46.

Little is known of either Myrtis or Corinna, the Bœotian rivals of Pindar. Myrtis seems to have composed lyric love stories, like the *Kalyke* of Stesichorus, and Corinna is chiefly cited by grammarians for her local dialect, of which some forty specimens are given.¹ Two Dorian poetesses, Telesilla of Argos, and Praxilla of Sicyon, are cited as of the same age, and of the same character, the few lines we have of Praxilla indicating a somewhat erotic tone.

§ 158. A more distinct and interesting personality is that of TIMOCREON the Rhodian. He was an athlete of renown, and an aristocrat of Ialysus, who was banished through suspicion of *medising*; he himself asserts that he bribed Themistocles to obtain his recall, and he reviles him for his refusal to interfere. He also quarrelled with Simonides, and the two poets gave vent to their anger in verses, of which those of Timocreon were the stronger, those of Simonides perhaps the keener. What is really interesting in Timocreon is his curious position as an aristocratic poet born out of due time. He wrote not for pay, but through passion, like Archilochus, like Alcæus, and the other stormy-lived bards of an earlier generation. Nevertheless, so firmly had the choral lyric form taken hold of the Greek mind, that this man's lampoons and satires are produced in the elaborate strophes of the Dorian hymns, and have puzzled the critics to assign them a title, which Bernhardt has made that of antistrophic skolion. This misfortune of a false form prevented Timocreon from pouring out his passion with the simple vigour of Archilochus; for the choral forms are not lyric in the modern sense, but epical and didactic, while real passion will not deck itself with such pomp and circumstance. We can imagine, too, how the paid poets of the early fifth century combined against this turbulent aristocrat, whose life was spent in war and travel, and who doubtless despised their mercenary muse. The ancient authorities concerning him are collected concisely by Bernhardt;²

¹ Pausanias says (ix. 22. 3), speaking of her picture in Tanagra, that she defeated Pindar on account of her writing not in Doric but Æolic dialect, and on account of her beauty, to judge from the picture.

² ii. p. 744.

the chief of them is Plutarch, who quotes a famous passage.¹ The scholiast on Aristophanes² cites also a well-known skolion on *Wealth*, because it is parodied in the text with reference to a decree of Pericles.

§ 159. The student who examines Bergk's *Lyric Fragments* will perhaps wonder at the numerous poets in his list who are not mentioned in this chapter. It is due to him, and to myself, that I should explain that, in the first place, several of them, such as Aristotle, will be considered again under that species of literature which they cultivated with most success. Others are post-classical ; and this objection is brought by the critics against many fragments attributed by Athenæus and Stobæus to classic names. Many others are known to us merely from a single citation, and neither their age nor their character can now be determined. Thus I have felt justified in avoiding here another list of barren names, such as we find at the close of the history of both epic and tragic poetry. Yet there are a few who are still interesting, and concerning whom I should gladly have said something in a more elaborate work. The fragments worth reading are those of Euenus, above mentioned ; of the philosopher Crates ; of Herodas, a writer of *Mimiambics* in the style of Hipponax ; of Praxilla, a poetess who composed social lyrics ; of Ariphron—a fine *Ode to Health* ; of Timotheus, a celebrated musical composer at the end of the classical period ; of Philoxenus, whose culinary ode, of which long fragments are extant, was in Aristotle's day very popular ; and

¹ *Themist.* 21 : 'Αλλ' εἰ τύγε Πανσανίαν ἢ καὶ τύγε Ξάνθιππον αἰνέεις
 ἢ τύγε Λευτυχίδαν, ἐγὼ δ' 'Αριστείδαν ἐπαινέω
 ἄνδρ' ἱερᾶν ἀπ' 'Αθανᾶν ἐλθέμεν
 λῶστον ἔν', ἐπεὶ Θεμιστοκλῆ' ἤχθαρε Λατῶ,
 ψεύσταν, ἄδικον, προδόταν, ὃς Τιμοκρέοντα
 ξεῖνον ἐόντ', ἀργυρίοις σκυβαλικοτοῖσι πεισθεὶς οὐ κατὰγεν
 ἐς πάτραν 'Ιάλυσον,
 λαβὼν δὲ τρὶ' ἀργυρίου τάλαντ' ἔβα πλέων εἰς ὕλεθρον,
 τοὺς μὲν κατὰγων ἀδίκως, τοὺς δ' ἐκδιώκων, τοὺς δὲ καίνων,
 ἀργυρίων ὑπόπλεως, 'Ισθμοῖ δὲ πανδόκευε γλοιῶς
 ψυχρὰ κρέα παρέχων, οἱ δ' ἥσθιον,
 κέχοντο μὴ ᾧραν Θεμιστοκλέος γενέσθαι.

² *Acharn.* 532 (frag. 8).

of Telestes. There are also many fine anonymous fragments, which seem to come from the greatest poets, such as Stesichorus or Pindar, and a few piquant popular songs, in addition to those already mentioned in this book. They indicate to us how small a fraction of Greek lyric poetry has survived, and how many great artists yet await a literary resurrection from the research of some fortunate explorer.

With the angry Timocreon I close the history of Greek lyric poetry, for though Pratinas and others were the contemporaries of the latter mentioned, they are closely connected with the dithyramb, and will be better discussed in the introduction to tragic than at the close of lyric poetry. The student should be reminded that in studying Greek Literature chronologically, he must now turn, before approaching the Attic Drama, to the history of prose writing, which was growing silently, and almost secretly, all through the sixth century B.C., though its bloom did not come till after the completion of Greek poetry by Æschylus and Scphocles. He will find this side of the subject treated in the opening chapters of my Second Volume.

APPENDIX.

ON THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK EPIC POETS, AND MORE ESPECIALLY OF THE ILIAD AND ODYSSEY.

IN determining the age and character of the Iliad and Odyssey, the most certain and important evidence to which we can appeal is the language of the poems. Here there can be no room for the individual taste or fancy of the critic; the conjectures and probabilities of the 'higher criticism,' as the Germans call it, have to make way for solid facts. If we know the age and locality of a particular word or grammatical form, we know also the limit of time to be assigned to the passage in which it

¹ Mr. D. B. Monro has criticised certain statements and conclusions of this Appendix, in the *Journal of Philology*, x. 18 (1881). My reply will be found in the same periodical, x. 19, pp. 110-120 (1881). Since then, in a very able article in Bezzenberger's *Beiträge*, vii. 2 (1882), August Fick has pursued the same line of argument as myself, and with the help of the Æolisms embedded in our present Homeric text, endeavoured to restore the Æolic original of the first 427 lines of the Iliad. His facts are mainly derived from Harder's Dissertation, 'De alpha vocali apud Homerum producta' (1876), and more especially the admirable treatise of Hinrichs, 'De homericæ elocutionis vestigiis Æolicis' (1875), to which I take this opportunity of recording my own obligations. Fick, writing as a comparative philologist, aptly calls the Homeric dialect 'a marvellous hodge-podge,' and holds that the digamma had been lost in Ionic before 700 B.C., when he supposes the old Æolic poems to have been handed on to the rhapsodists of Ionia. Much of what other scholars regard as Old Ionic, he would term Æolic. Like myself, he endorses Merzdorf's summing-up of an elaborate examination of the Ionic dialect (Curtius' *Studien zur g. und l. Gramm.* 1876, p. 214), to the effect that the Ionic of Homer and the Ionic of Herodotos are in the same stage of development.

As I find that what I have said about Middle Ionic has been misunder-

occurs, as well as the geographical horizon of the author. A form like *ἄκων*,¹ instead of the older *ἄφέκων*, could not have come into existence until all recollection of the digamma had disappeared, while the *Æolisms*, which, as we shall see, occur here and there in Homer, point to an early connection of epic poetry with the *Æolic* towns of Asia Minor.

stood, it is as well to explain here that the *philological* periods through which a dialect passes are of course not the same as *chronological* periods, all intermediate forms not being necessarily contemporaneous, any more than the use of stone or bronze tools in all parts of the world. In one important point, it will be seen from my reply to Mr. Monro, I have changed my opinion since this Appendix was written, as I now feel convinced that Prof. Paley is right in considering our present Homeric text not older than the age of Periklês. This, however, only supplements, and in no way corrects, the conclusions already arrived at in the Appendix, which is accordingly left unchanged. I also now feel doubtful whether the lengthening of a short vowel before μέγας is due to false analogy; at all events, as I have pointed out in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, i. 1, p. 258 (1880), the initial of the word is aspirated in Pamphylian, being written μH, and may have been so in Cyprian, a dialect of which traces can be detected in Homer. I have only to add that the Appendix offers nothing more than a summary of linguistic criticism on the text of Homer. Most of the facts adduced have already been published by former scholars.

I have to thank Mr. George MacMillan for verifying and correcting the references.

Additional note.—I have suggested another explanation of ἀ(ν)δρωτήτρα than that given above, in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, i. p. 258 (1880). As δρου is found in the New Ionic inscription of Halikarnassos published by Newton (*Essays on Art and Archaeology*, pp. 427, &c.), which seems to belong to the age of Herodotus, it is possible that the Homeric δπως, &c. should be ascribed to one of the New Ionic dialects. But in this case the form (derived from the old Epic δππως) would be a very late one. In the *American Journal of Philology*, Mr. Packard has impugned some of the statements made in the text. His corrections, however, are usually wrong, e.g., ἀν κεν occurs only once in the Iliad, not twice; ἀριθμός and εὐχή are not found in the Iliad; for the purposes of the argument it does not matter whether φύλακος is a common noun or a fictitious proper name; I have naturally not said that θῶω and τῶω do not occur in Homer, as my argument is that old and new are mixed together in the Epic dialect; 'Attic poets' are not necessarily the tragic poets; Sappho's dialect is certainly an 'artificial' one.

¹ *Il.* Ε 366; *Od.* γ 484.

Thanks to Comparative Philology and the discovery and accurate study of numerous inscriptions during the last quarter of a century, the history of the Greek language and its dialects is now fairly well known. We can tell with certainty what sounds and grammatical forms are later than others, what are the dialects to which each must be referred, what words must be regarded, not as the creations of a living speech, but as the artificial products of a learned language. Thus a word like *ἐπάλμενος*,¹ which preserves a lingering trace of the original sibilant we find in the cognate Latin *salio*, is plainly of older date than the contracted *ἐπάλμενος*,² in which all such trace has vanished. Thus, again, the form *ἐννοσίγαιος*, which is found twenty-one times in the *Iliad* and fifteen times in the *Odyssey*, and in which the initial digamma of its second component element (Greek *φωθέω*, Sanskrit *vâdh*) has been assimilated to the preceding nasal, belongs to the Æolic dialect; while the form *εἰνοσίφυλλος*, which is found twice in the *Iliad*³ and once in the *Odyssey*,⁴ declares itself to be Ionic by its initial diphthong. And thus, finally, a form like *εἴσατο*,⁵ from *εἶμι*, the Latin *ire*, has evidently been coined for merely metrical reasons after the analogy of words like *ἔειπον* and *εἴσατο* (from *vid*, 'to wit'), where the hiatus really represents a lost digamma.

A close examination of the language of Homer shows that it is a mosaic in which words belonging to different ages and three different dialects—Æolic, Ionic, and Attic—are mixed together in such a way as to prove it to be an artificial dialect, never really spoken by the people, but slowly elaborated by successive generations of poets for the needs of epic composition. In its present form it cannot be earlier than the seventh century before the Christian era—the age, in fact, to which Euphoriion and Theopompus assigned Homer. Let us review as shortly as we can the evidence on which these assertions are based.

In the first place, then, the staple of the Homeric dialect is

¹ *Il.* H 15; *Od.* ω 320.

² *Il.* H 260, A 421, M 404; *Od.* ξ 220.

³ *Il.* B 632, 757.

⁴ *Od.* ι 22.

⁵ *Il.* O 415, 544; *Od.* χ 89.

Ionic, but Ionic of three different periods, which may be conveniently termed Old Ionic, Middle Ionic, and New Ionic. By New Ionic is meant the language of Ionia as it existed in the time of Herodotus, and of the greater part of the Ionic inscriptions we possess; and it may be considered to date back as far as the beginning of the sixth century B.C., to which two or three inscriptions belong. For both Old and Middle Ionic we have only the Homeric poems themselves, the older grammatical forms of which can be determined by a comparison with Sanskrit, Latin, and the other allied languages. The New Ionic genitive singular in *-ου*, for example, presupposes an older uncontracted genitive in *-οο*, and this again must be connected with the Sanskrit *-asya*, which, after the usual Greek change of *y* into a vowel and loss of the sibilant, would have taken the form of *-οιο*. Now in Homer, besides the New Ionic genitive in *-ου*, we also find the older form in *-οιο*, as well as in a few instances the intermediate form in *-οο*. Examples of the latter will be seen in such phrases as *Ἰλῖοο προπάρουθεν*,¹ *Ἀιόλοο κλυτά*,² and *ῥοκράτος*,³ where the ignorance of copyists has introduced into the text the impossible forms *Ἰλῖον* and *ῥον*, and by reading *Ἀιόλου* has ruined the metre of the passage in the tenth book of the *Odyssey*.⁴ The discovery of these Middle Ionic genitives and the consequent restoration of Homeric grammar and metre are due to Comparative Philology.

It would be both tedious and useless to multiply instances of this juxtaposition in Homer of forms which belong to different stages in the growth of the Ionic dialect. Thus we have the older genitive plural *νυμφάων*, where the sibilant, which appears as *r* in the Latin *nympharum* for *nymphasum*, has been dropped between the two vowels in accordance with Greek custom, and by the side of *νυμφάων* we have also the later *νυμφέων* with a shortened vowel, and the still later contracted *νυμφῶν*.⁵ Thus,

¹ *Il.* O 66.² *Od.* κ 60.³ *Od.* α 70.⁴ See also *Il.* B 518, Γ 340, I 137, 279, Λ 130, 715; *Od.* ο 334, π 313, 396, φ 124, 149. Ahrens was the first to discover this form (*Rhein. Mus.* ii. 161).⁵ The old genitive in *-άων*, like most archaic forms in Homer, always occupies a fixed place (except in *Il.* ζ 364 and Ω 615, and in the case

too, along with the Old Ionic *νηος*, where the initial vowel represents the long vowel and digamma of the Sanskrit *nāv-as* and Latin *nāv-is*, we meet the shortened New Ionic *νεός*; and the datives *ἡρώι* and *γῆραι*¹ stand by the side of the abbreviated *ἡρω* and *γῆρα*.² When we find the late contracted *ἡλιος*³ with the erroneous Attic aspiration, we may feel sure that we are dealing with a passage of much more modern date than the phrases and formulæ which contain the older *ἡέλιος* (for *ἡσέλιος*, the Old Latin *Aurelius* or *Auselios*, from the root *ush*, 'to burn'). So, too, the short quantity of the first syllable of *θύω*, *λύω*, *φύω*, and *τίω* (for *θυίω*, *λυίω*, *φυίω*, and *τιίω*) reminds us that Homer is in all these cases adopting the usage of the New Ionic dialect, and is thus less primitive than the Attic poets who preserve the original length of the syllable in question.⁴ Still more instructive is the varying employment of certain words, sometimes with a double *s*, sometimes with a single one, the choice of the form being frequently determined by metrical reasons alone. Comparative Philology teaches us that in almost every instance the form with double *s* was the original one, the form with single *s* being the result of that phonetic decay which made Old Ionic pass successively into Middle and New Ionic. A large number of stems both of nouns and verbs ended in a sibilant, which was naturally doubled when a suffix which began with another sibilant was attached to them. From the stem *μελες*, for example, we

of the pronoun *τῶν*). This place is either (1) the end of the line, or (2) the thesis of the first or second foot (in the *Il.* only in disyllabic stems, contrary to the use of the *Odyssey*, see *Od.* α 334, γ 307, ν 126, π 416, σ 210, φ 65), or (3) the fourth foot (in the arsis when preceded by a short syllable, in the thesis when preceded by a long one).

¹ *Il.* Γ 150, Ε 153, Κ 79, Σ 434; *Od.* Β 16, ο 357.

² *Il.* Η 453; *Od.* θ 483, λ 136, ψ 283. Similarly we find *ἔρφ* (*Od.* σ 212), *γέλφ* (*Od.* σ 100), *ἔρφ* (*Il.* Π 385, 745).

³ *Od.* θ 271.

⁴ However, we find *ἄπιτος* in *Il.* Ξ 484, though *ἄπιτος* occurs in the preceding book (Ν 414). Similarly we meet with *πρίν* sometimes with the vowel long (as in *Il.* Β 348, Ε 288, Ζ 81, Η 390, Θ 474), sometimes with the vowel short (as in *Il.* Β 344, 354, 413, Γ 132, Δ 114, Ε 127, 472, Ζ 125, Ι 403).

ought to get μέλεσ-σι by adding the suffix of the dative plural, and from the stem τελεσ the verbal forms τελέσ-σω and ἐτέλεσ-σα by adding the suffixes of the sigmatic future and aorist. In the same way from a stem like ποδ we should have the dative plural πόδ-σι, and then by assimilation πόσσι. The shortened forms could have come only gradually into use in the actual language of the Ionians, and their existence in the epic dialect side by side with the fuller and older forms reveals unmistakably its real nature. We may gain some idea of the relative antiquity of the Iliad and Odyssey from the fact that whereas there are fifty-eight aorists with double *s* as against forty-two with single *s* in the first poem, the proportion in the second poem is fifty-four to fifty-three.

The use of the digamma, however, affords the clearest illustration of the mode in which the Homeric dialect was formed. This letter, which corresponded in sound to our *w*, tended to disappear at an early date in the Ionic dialect, much as *w* tends to disappear in certain English dialects, which say 'ooman for woman, or as it has universally disappeared in the pronunciation of proper names like *Woolwich* and *Harwich*. The other Greek dialects retained it up to a considerably later date, though it was eventually lost in all of them. The Eleian inscriptions found at Olympia show that the digamma was there in common use, official documents from Bœotia write it in certain words up to the third century B.C., and the Æolic dialect of Cyprus, as revealed to us by the decipherment of the so-called Cypriote syllabary, preserved it in everyday speech at least as late as the fourth century before the Christian era.

We may approximately refer the disappearance of the digamma in Ionia to the beginning of the seventh century B.C. No example of it happens to occur in the inscriptions scratched by the Ionic mercenaries of the Egyptian king Psammetichus on the colossi at Abu-Simbel, B.C. 620 (or, as is perhaps more probable, B.C. 590)—inscriptions which show how widely spread a knowledge of writing must have been at the time in Ionia. A short inscription, however, assigned to about B.C. 500, has been discovered in Naxos, on which we read the word ΑΨΤΟ (=αὐτοῦ), though unfortunately the

genuineness of this inscription is disputed. But no doubt hangs over certain Chalcidian inscriptions of Magna Græcia, which contain examples of the digamma ; and since the Chalcidian colonies were sent out about 700-660 B.C., the digamma could not have been lost in the Ionic dialect until a subsequent period. Accordingly the Old Ionic of Homer in which the digamma is preserved must have been still spoken in Eubœa at the beginning of the seventh century B.C.

But besides digammated words we find in Homer a number of undigammated ones. These fall into two classes. The first class consists of words like οὐρανός, ὄχρος, ὦρος, which we know from the cognate languages once possessed a digamma, but which show no trace of it in Homer, that is, which have lost the sound in question in the earliest form of Old Ionic with which we are acquainted. The second class contains words which appear in the poems sometimes with, sometimes without, a digamma, the pronunciation being frequently determined by metrical reasons alone. Of such words there are at least thirty-five. Examples of them are given in the foot-note.¹

¹ Οἶκος always with digamma except in *Il.* Ω 572 ; *Od.* μ 135, ν 42, ξ 223, 318, ο 21, π 70, 303, σ 419, ω 208 ; οἶνος always with digamma except in *Il.* B 641, E 706, 813, I 224, K 497, Σ 545 ; *Od.* γ 40, 46, 51, ζ 77, λ 61, ο 334, 507, τ 122, ν 260, φ 142 ; οἶδα always with digamma except in *Il.* Σ 185, and *Od.* ρ 573 ; ὕψ always with digamma except in *Il.* Α 137, Φ 98 ; *Od.* ε 61 ; Ὀδυσσεύς without digamma except in *Il.* Α 140 ; *Od.* α 21, ν 126, ξ 152, ρ 157, ν 239, φ 197, 204, 244, χ 45, ω, 328 ; οἴσσειν without digamma (*Il.* Α 89, B 229, E 257, Θ 400, K 337, N 820, Ξ 308, X 425, Ψ 663, 858 ; *Od.* γ 429, π 438, τ 24, ν 154, χ 101) except in *Il.* Ψ 441 ; οἶρος without digamma (*Il.* Α 479, Ξ 19 ; *Od.* γ 176, δ 360, 585, ε 167, 176, λ 640, μ 167) except in *Od.* δ 520 ; οἴχομαι without digamma except in *Od.* π 142 ; ὄπλον without digamma except in *Od.* β 430, φ 390 ; εἰωνός without digamma except in *Il.* Z 76. So, again, ἵπος has digamma in *Od.* σ 73, 75, 333, 334, 393, but wants it in σ 233 ; and ἡχή, which has the digamma in four passages of Hesiod (*Scut.* 279, 348, 438 ; *Opp.* 582), wants it in Homer. Οἰζέτης in *Il.* B 765 preserves the initial digamma of ἔτος (Sanskrit *vatsas*), which is elsewhere lost, as in the compound ἐπετήσιος of *Od.* η 118. Cauer has drawn up the following table of the cases in which the pronoun of the third person, which was the last to retain traces of its consonantal beginning, (1) must be pronounced with digamma, (2) may or may not be so pronounced, (3) cannot be so pronounced :—

From these examples it is clear that three conclusions must be drawn : (1) Portions of the Homeric poems consisting of certain phrases and formulæ belong to the Old Ionic dialect in which the sound of the digamma was still heard. (2) Other portions belong to a later stage of the dialect, when the digamma had ceased to be pronounced, and even such traces of it as a hiatus or a lengthened vowel had passed away. (3) A time arrived when the existence of the digamma had so far faded from the memory of the rhapsodists that they came to regard the hiatus representing the lost digamma in certain traditional verses and expressions as due to 'metrical necessity,' and consequently to be admitted or excluded according to the requirements of the verse.

The last conclusion is confirmed by the occurrence of the hiatus in the case of words in which no consonant had ever been lost. Thus, as has already been noticed, we find *ἔεισατο* from *εἶμι*, the Latin *ire*, a form which owes its origin to the mistaken analogy of words like *ἔειπον* (for *ἔειφεπον*, root *φεπ*). Another instance will be *νεοαρδής* in Il. Φ 346, where the second part of the compound represents the Sanskrit *ârdras*, 'wet,' unless we adopt the variant reading *νεαλεῖ*. In fact, the use of the digamma shows that a large part of the Iliad and Odyssey is composed in quite as artificial a language as the epics of Apollonius Rhodius or Quintus Smyrnæus. The digamma is frequently observed in appearance only, a hiatus being allowed by the poets, not because they remembered that it took the place of an original consonant, but because they found what seemed to them a hiatus in the poetical 'tags' and formulæ which had been handed down to them. In this way alone can we explain the disproportionate preponderance of the hiatus in a few words like *ὄς*, *οἷ*, and *οἷδα*—the very words which also show a hiatus in other epic and elegiac poetry—or the fact

	Digamma necessary	Not necessary	Neglected
<i>εἶο</i> , <i>εἶο</i> , <i>εἶ</i>	14 times	7 times	1 time
<i>ἔθεν</i>	7 „	11 „	—
<i>οἷ</i>	643 „	over 180 „	23 times
<i>εἶ</i>	64 „	15 „	1 time
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
<i>ὄς</i>	45	176	31

pointed out by Hoffmann, that although in the *Iliad* a short final syllable remains short before $\sigma\tilde{\iota}$, the latter word never causes the elision of a preceding vowel or the shortening of a preceding long syllable.¹

If we enquire into the use of the digamma in Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, the fragments of the Cyclic poets, and in Empedocles, Tyrtaeus, and the Elegiac and Iambic writers generally, we shall find some reason for the old Greek tradition which assigned all epic heroic literature, along with the Hymns, the *Margites*, and the *Batrachomyomachia*, to the author of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. In the earliest of these productions remains of the Old Ionic dialect are embedded much as in the Homeric poems, while in the rest the hiatus that distinguishes originally digammated words is due to the mere repetition or imitation of ancient epic formulæ. Thus in the *Theogony* the proportion of cases in which the digamma is observed to those in which it is not is as 3 or 4 to 1, a larger proportion than that presented by the *Odyssey*; in the *Works and Days* the proportion is as 3 to 1, as also in the Hymn to Aphrodite; whereas in the Hymn to Demeter the proportion is exactly equal, in the Hymn to Hermes as 1 to $1\frac{1}{3}$, and in the cyclic fragments (excluding the *Kypria*) and the *Batrachomyomachia* as 1 to 6. On the other hand, the proportion in Empedocles is as 1 to 3, though how little Empedocles was acquainted with the true origin of the epic hiatus is shown by his incorrect introduction of it in such analogic coinages as $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ (root *ad*) and $\acute{\alpha}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$. The Elegiac and Iambic poets preserve the digamma, or rather the hiatus which had taken its place, in a good number of the words in which it occurs in Homer, and Theognis has it even in $\iota\omicron\nu$, 'a violet,' and $\iota\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$, where it has been lost in the language of our *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (except ϵ 72, δ 314). In his use of these two words, however, Theognis was probably imitating some portion of the old epic literature.

But the digamma is not the only lost letter of which traces survive here and there in Homer. Another sound which disappeared at a yet earlier time than the digamma was the *yod*

¹ Hoffmann, *Quæstiones Homericae*, p. 56.

or *y*. The conservative dialect of Cyprus was the only one in Greece which preserved the *yod* into the days of writing ; here it regularly occurs along with the digamma in inscriptions written in the characters of the Cypriote syllabary as late as the fourth century B.C. It is commonly supposed that *ōc*, *ōs*, and *ōti* primitively began with this letter, and answered to the Sanscrit *yas* and *yāvat* ; in this case the *yod* would have to be restored to these words in such phrases as *θεὸς ὦc*, where the lengthening of the final syllable of the first word implies an initial consonant in the second.¹ The Locrian inscriptions of the fifth century B.C., however, write *φότι* with digamma and not *yod* ; and it is therefore better to connect *ōc* and its derivatives with the Latin *qui*, *quis*, and Sanskrit *chit*, and to regard its lost letter as a digamma. A more certain instance of the presence of the *yod* is *ἴεσθαι* (from the root *yā*), which has a consonantal beginning in twenty-two passages.

A tendency to drop a *sigma* seems to have set in at an even earlier period than a tendency to drop the *yod*. Words like *ἰδρῶς* (English *sweat*), which originally began with two consonants (*sw*), must have lost the first at quite a remote date ; indeed, in this particular word and its derivatives even the digamma is only once preserved (in Il. Δ 27). Sometimes, however, the digamma became *φ*, as has happened in the case of the reflexive pronoun *σφε*, though even this change did not always preserve the sibilant.² When the second consonant was *λ*, *μ*, or *ν*, the initial sibilant was generally retained in Æolic (as *σμικρος*) and probably also in the Old Ionic of Homer, or else was assimilated to the sound that followed. Thus we have *ἄ-λληκτος* for *ἀ-σληκτος* (our *slack*), or *φιλο-μειδης* for *φιλο-σμειδης* from the root *smi*, 'to smile.' Wherever such compounds occur in the poems, or wherever the lengthening of a short syllable indicates the preservation of the sibilant at the commencement of the following word, we may be sure that we are in the presence of an old formation. It is quite other-

¹ When the final syllable remains short, as in *βόες ὦs* (Od. χ 299) we may feel sure that we are dealing with the product of a later age.

² Bugge, for instance, has argued that *φι-λός* has the same root as *σφε*, and originally meant 'one's own.'

wise, however, when the word before which the short syllable is lengthened or a letter doubled can be proved by comparison with the allied languages to have never possessed more than one initial consonant. When, for example, we find such compounds as ἐπιλίγδην, 'grazing,'¹ ἐπιτέλλω,² or such expressions as αἶθωνά μεγάθυμον,³ Αἴαντᾶ μεγαλήτορα,⁴ κατὰ μοῖραν,⁵ we are transported to a wholly new era, an era when the poets had forgotten the real origin of the doubled letter and the lengthened syllable, and imagined that they too might double a letter or lengthen a syllable at will should the metre so require. Such cases of false analogy belong to an artificial dialect which is separated by many generations from the Old Ionic of the earliest parts of Homer. The origin, for instance, of ἔλλαβε (root *labh*) and ἔμμαθε (root *manth*) is the same as that of ἔλλιπε in Apollonius Rhodius—the misleading analogy of misunderstood archaisms.

We must here turn aside for a moment to point out the cases in which the hiatus or the lengthening of a naturally short syllable may be assumed to imply a lost consonant. It is well known that other causes may be called in to account for both. Sometimes such violations of Greek metrical usage are due to the cæsure, sometimes to the misconceptions of the later poets. A careful examination of Homeric literature, however, would seem to show that licenses of this kind were not originally permissible, and only crept in through the progress of phonetic decay in the Ionic dialect which occasioned the shortening of syllables and the loss of letters, and the consequent belief that the earlier poets had allowed themselves licenses 'for the sake of the metre.' Thus the final *α* of neuters plural and the final *-ι* of datives singular were once long, and Hartel has shown that passages exist in Homer in which the primitive quantity of these terminations is preserved. So, again, the frequent hiatus after the particle ἦ arises from the fact that the word was originally ἦφε, and consequently the apparent hiatus is no hiatus at all except in the verses of later imitators. Elsewhere the hiatus is found after *-ι* and *-υ*, the explanation being that the

¹ *Il.* P 599.² *Od.* ψ 361.³ *Il.* Π 488.⁴ *Il.* P 526.⁵ *Il.* Π 367.

semi-vowels *y* and *v* were sounded after these letters in Old Ionic when another vowel followed, so that formations like *ἀμφ-ουᾱίς*¹ or *ἀμφ-ήκης*² must be assigned to the New Ionic period. Similarly, we find prepositions which, like *ἐκ* and *ἐν*, begin with a vowel admitting the hiatus because of the genitives and datives in *-ου* and *-ω* or *-ι* with which they were used (e.g. *ἐϋπλέκτω ἐνὶ δῖφρῳ*). Wherever another vowel precedes, there can be little doubt that we have to do with the product of false analogy and of a later age. In other cases the hiatus is explained by its coming after stems which originally ended with a consonant, such as *βοῖ* or *ταυαῖ*. Its occurrence after *πρό* (as in *προερέσσω* or *προιάλλω*) may be accounted for by the original form of the preposition *πρωῖ*. The contracted forms *προϋτνψαν*,³ *προϋθηκεν*,⁴ and *προϋχων*⁵ betray their more recent date. Apart from certain composite or polysyllabic words, all other examples of the hiatus or the lengthening of a short syllable in the older parts of Homer must be taken to indicate a lost consonant.

If we assign the transition of Old Ionic into Middle Ionic to the beginning of the seventh century B.C., we shall not be far from the truth. New Ionic may be said to commence with the inscriptions of Abu-Simbel, referred to above, and to continue to the age of Hippocrates, when it becomes considerably tainted by Atticisms. It is best illustrated by the dialect of Herodotus and contemporaneous inscriptions, a dialect, be it observed, which is substantially identical with that of the New Ionic portions of Homer. The proof of this it would take too long to give here, but the fact can easily be tested by comparing a dictionary of Herodotus with a dictionary of Homer.⁶

¹ *Od.* ρ 237.

² *Il.* K 256; *Od.* π 80.

³ *Il.* O 306.

⁴ *Il.* Ω 409.

⁵ *Il.* X 97; *Od.* ζ 138.

⁶ Thus Herodotus and Homer have *τιθείσι*, *ιέισι*, *διδοῦσι*, *ῥηγνῦσι* instead of the Attic *τιθέασι*, &c.; Herodotus and Homer alone have the later *εἰμέν* for *ἔσμεν*; Herodotus usually omits the temporal augment, especially before double consonants (e.g. *ἀρρώδεον*, *ἔρδον*, *ἀπαλλάσσουντο*) and diphthongs (e.g. *εἴκαζε*, *αἴρεε*), and drops it in *χρῆν* and the iterative and pluperfect; and Homer uses the New Ionic *εἰς* of Herodotus as well as the old Ionic *ἔσσι*. The analogic *διδάσσομεν* (*Od.* ν 358, ω 314) reminds us of *λάμψομαι* in Herodotus, and the latter's *μεμετιμένος* can be

In two or three respects, indeed, the forms of Herodotus are more archaic than those of the Iliad and Odyssey. Thus the MSS. of Herodotus still offer *ἐάνδανε* (for *ἐφάνδανε*),¹ whereas we have the Ionicised form *ἐήνδανε* in *Il.* Ω 25, and *Od.* γ 143, and the later contracted from *ἦνδανε* in *Il.* Α 24, 378, Σ 510, &c.² The Attic contraction of *αείρω*, again, which occurs in *Il.* Ν 63, is not found in Herodotus, and while Herodotus has the more original *κορέσω*, Homer has the later (Atticising) *κορέει* and *κορέεις*.³

What is much more remarkable, however, is that the MSS. of Homer contain numerous examples of two forms which do not appear in New Ionic inscriptions before the beginning of the fourth century B.C., and are probably due to Attic influence. These forms are those of the genitives in -ΕΥ and -ΕΥΣ, instead of the older -ΕΟ and -ΕΟΣ. Thus we have *ἐμεῦ*, *γένευσ*, *θέρευσ*.

No doubt it is possible that the diphthong in question is a scribe's error, introduced where the double syllable *εο* was pronounced by 'synizesis' as one. But this does not alter the really important fact of the case. Whether we call it synizesis or anything else, *εο* is in very many instances pronounced as a single syllable in the Homeric poems, that is, has become a diphthong. It is quite immaterial whether this diphthong was

paralleled in Homer by similar products of false analogy. The hystero-gen *σταίησαν* for *σταῖεν* occurs in the Iliad (P 733) as well as in Herodotus and Thucydides; the plural terminations -οἶατο, -ήατο, and -έατο, which alone are found in Homer, are Herodotean, as is also *ἔωθα* (*Il.* Θ 408), instead of the older *εἴωθα*; and Homer and Herodotus alike have the forms *ῥια*, *ῥιε*, *ῥισαν* (*Il.* Α 47, Η 213, Κ 197, Ν 305). Homer also offers us the Herodotean *φύλακος* (*Il.* Ζ 35, Ω 566; *Od.* ο 231), and *μάρτυροι* (*Il.* Α 338, Β 302, Γ 280, Ξ 274, Χ 255; *Od.* α 273, ξ 394). Other New Ionicisms will be *ιστιή* for *ἐστία*, *μίν*, *Πάριος* (*Il.* Γ 325) by the side of *Πάριδος*, and the lost aspirate in *μετάλμενος* (*Il.* Ε 336), *ἐπάλμενος* (*Il.* Η 260), *ἐπίστιον* (*Od.* ζ 265), and *αὐτόδιον* (*Od.* θ 449). About ninety iteratives in -σκον are met with in Homer, as against only ten in Hesiod. Pindar has three, and the Attic tragedians four, which are plainly adopted from Homer, and none are found in Attic prose. Many, however, occur in Herodotus, though it must be added that the iteratives of the sigmatic iorist (like *ἐλάσασκε*) all belong to Homer.

¹ Herod. ix. 5, 19.

² Similarly *ἐπιήνδανε* (*Od.* ν 16, &c.).

³ *Il.* Θ 379, Ν 831.

sounded exactly in the same way as *ευ* or not. The inscriptions show that before the fourth century B.C. *εο* had *not* become a diphthong in New Ionic, and that when it did become a diphthong it was represented as *ευ*. It is hard to believe that an artificial dialect like the Epic, which aimed at being archaic, would have anticipated the innovating pronunciation of the spoken language.

But there are some other philological peculiarities in the language of Homer which seem to imply that the poems were revised and additions made to them here and there as late even as the New Attic period. Thus we find words known to us by Alexandrine use like *βλώσκω*,¹ *στιχεῖν*,² *σκάζω*, *κροαίνω*³ and *στυγεῖν*,⁴ *ἔχραισμον* and *παιφάσσω*,⁵ which are common to Homer and Apollonius Rhodius, and *ἐρυκανάω*, which elsewhere occurs only in Quintus Smyrnæus. From the post-Homeric *κηκίς* we get the verbal *ἀνε-κήκειε*, and the weak passive future *μιγήσεσθαι*⁶ has been formed after the false analogy of forms like *βήσομαι*.

We must now pass on to the second point we have to prove, the existence of other dialects than Ionic in the language of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. These dialects are the *Æolic* and the *Attic*. Of the *Doric* dialect there is no trace. The forms which have been quoted as *Doric* are really archaisms which belonged to Old Ionic and were preserved among the conservative Dorians after their disappearance among the Ionians. In *έσσεῖ-αι*, for instance, we have the old formative of the future *γα* which existed in Sanskrit as well as in ancient Greek; the dative *τέϊν* for *τεφι(ν)* is an archaic form which belonged to Old Ionic as much as to *Doric*; and infinitives like *χολώσεμεν* are equally survivals from an early period of the Ionic dialect itself. The pronoun *τύνη*, which occurs six times in the poems, similarly preserves the nasal which makes its appearance in the *Æolic* *τούν* and the Sanskrit *twam*, and has been counted as *Doric* only because that most conservative of the Greek dialects preserved a word which in later times elsewhere disappeared.

¹ *Od.* π 466, τ 25, φ 239, 385. ² *Il.* π 258. ³ *Il.* ζ 507, ο 264.

⁴ *Od.* κ 113.

⁵ *Il.* β 450.

⁶ *Il.* κ 365.

The Ionic poets would have nothing to do with that detested Dorian race which drove their forefathers from their old homes in Greece, and the only passage in which Dorians are named is Od. τ 177, where a list is given of the various tribes inhabiting Krete. The elegiac poets whose dialect was based on that of epic literature show the same aversion to anything Dorian. It is only his *Embateria* that Tyrtaeus composes in Doric, and even Theognis but once uses the preposition *πορί*, which is found eighty-nine times in Homer and, though originally common to all the Greek dialects, had come to be preserved in Doric alone.¹

The avoidance of the Doric dialect on the part of Homer is brought out into greater relief by the usage of the Hesiodic poems in which we find such decided Dorisms as the shortened final syllable of *προπαῖς*,² two genitives in *-ᾶν* instead of the Ionic *-ῶν*,³ the pronoun *ἵν* for *οἷ*,⁴ and the Doric *ῆν* for *ῆσαν*.⁵ Ahrens believes that the Dorisms of Hesiod are specifically Delphian; however that may be, the contrast between the two classes of epic poetry, the heroic and the didactic, in this respect confirms in a striking way the Asiatic origin of Homer. It is difficult to believe that a dialect which had grown up on the soil of either the Peloponnesus or Northern Greece could have remained so thoroughly untainted by Doric forms and words.

It is quite different when we turn to the remains of the Æolic dialect which have been detected in the poems. Æolisms are embedded in Homer like flies in amber; they are scattered up and down both in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, though almost always in fixed places in the verse. Thus we find *ζάθεος* with the Æolic *ζα* for *διὰ* as an epithet of the Æolic towns Killa,⁶ Nisa,⁷ Krisa,⁸ and Pheræ,⁹ the Ionic form of which was Theræ, but always at the beginning of the thesis of the second foot; once, and once

¹ *Πρός* is found two hundred times in Homer, and the older *πορί* sixty times. The word has no connection, except in meaning, with *πορί* and the contracted *πός*.

² So, too, *κούπαῖς* (*Th.* 60), *δήσαῖς* (*Th.* 521).

⁴ *Frag.* 134.

⁵ *Th.* 321, 825.

⁷ *Il.* B 508.

⁸ *Il.* B 520.

³ *Opp.* 144, *Th.* 41.

⁶ *Il.* A 38, 452.

⁹ *Il.* I 151, 293.

only,¹ do we meet the word in a different formula and in a different place, the end of the line. Here, however, it is an epithet of the Doric Kythera, and belongs plainly to an imitator of a later age who found the old stock epithet convenient for terminating his verse. Other Æolic epithets of the same kind are ζαής,² ζατρεφής,³ and ζαχρηής.⁴ Indeed, as might have been expected, it is especially in the case of epithets that remains of the Æolic dialect have been handed down. Ἀμύμων, for instance, where the Æolic υ takes the place of the Ionic ω, has become so trite and meaningless an epithet as to be applied to Ægisthus.⁵ Ταλαύρινος and καλαύριψ, again, are Æolisms, as also ἀγανός, as well as the numerous compounds of which ἐρι-, instead of the Ionic ἀρι-, forms the first part. Since the use of ε in place of α before ρ characterised Æolic, the form of the name Θερσίτης is an evident proof that Thersites belonged to the older portions of the Homeric poems, and figured in the legends that circulated in Æolis. The same may also be said of Halitherses,⁶ Thersilokhus,⁷ and Polytherseides.⁸ If Herodian is right, the varying declension of the name Sarpêdon as Σαρπήδοντος and Σαρπηδόνης is due to the fact that the first is an Æolism; but this statement is extremely doubtful, since the vocalisation of the word is Ionic, and the hero himself was a Lycian, and belongs therefore to Ionic and not Æolic legend, while the preservation of the initial sibilant merely shows that the name has come down unchanged in its Old Ionic dress.⁹ Similarly it is probable that the form σμικρός is old Ionic and

¹ *Il.* O 432.

² *Od.* ε 368, μ 313.

³ *Il.* H 223; *Od.* ξ 19, δ 451.

⁴ *Il.* E 525, M 347, 360.

⁵ *Od.* α 29.

⁶ *Od.* β 157, 253, ρ 68, ω 451.

⁷ *Il.* P 216, φ 209.

⁸ *Od.* χ 287.

⁹ The root is that of ἔρπειν, *serpere*, Sanskrit *sarp*. In bringing him from Lycia the legends made the usual confusion between the terrestrial Lycia and the celestial Lycia ('the land of light,' Latin *lux*), though no doubt the struggles between the Ionic emigrants to Asia Minor and the Lycian natives occasioned the localisation of the myth in that particular spot. It is possible, however, that the name Lycia was of Greek origin, given to a mountainous country where the inhabitants of the coast saw the sun rise in the morning, since the Lycians called themselves Termilæ (Tranelê in the native inscriptions).

not Æolic, which, as in *Σμύρνα*, kept the original *s* before *m*, although *σμυγερός*, *σμυγερώς* are certainly Æolisms. Solitary Æolisms have been preserved by the metre in *πίσυρες*,¹ *κεκλήγοντες*,² and the vocative *νύμφα*,³ and in *φήρ*.⁴ To the metre, again, we must ascribe the preservation of the Æolic forms of the personal pronouns.⁵ Other Æolisms, no doubt, once existed here and there in the text of which no trace now remains, since in two passages, *φλίψεται* for the received *θλίψεται*,⁶ and *πώρδαλις* for the Aristarchean *πάρδαλις*,⁷ were read by Zenodotus and the Venetian Codex. A fortunate chance has preserved for us the specifically Æolic title *αἰσυμνήτης* in *Od. θ* 258. Several other Æolisms may further be detected in the poems;⁸ among these *κέν*, by the side of the Ionic *ἄν*, is the most noticeable. In the *Iliad* *κέν* occurs 121 times before vowels, 78 times before consonants; *κὲ* occurs 145 times, *κ'* 76 times, *χ'* 4 times, *εἰσόκεν* 7 times, *εἰσόκε* 18 times, *εἰσόκ'* 3 times, *ὤς κεν* and *ὦς κε* 11 times. On the other hand, *ἄν* is found 137 times, and the compound *ἄν κεν* once.⁹ Such a compound could only have been formed when all sense of the original meaning of *κεν* had passed away. Perhaps, however, the best-known Æolism is the nominative of masculine nouns of the first declension, like *νεφεληγερέτα*. We find it almost always in certain stock phrases and set positions. In *αἰχμητά*¹⁰ the form has been half Ionised after the model of *αἰχμητής*, which thrice occurs¹¹ in imitation of the older usage.

¹ *Il. O* 680; *Od. ε* 70.

² *Od. μ* 256, ξ 30.

³ *Il. Γ* 130; *Od. δ* 743.

⁴ *Il. A* 268, B 743.

⁵ Namely, *ἄμμες* (*Il. Φ* 432; *Od. ι* 303, 321, χ 55); *ἄμμι(ν)* twenty-one times; *ἄμμε* (*Il. A* 59, H 292, 378, 397, K 346, Ξ 62, Σ 268, X 219, Ω 355; *Od. ι* 404, κ 209, μ 221, χ 73); *ἔμμες* (*Il. A* 274, 335, Ξ 481, Ψ 469, Ω 242; *Od. φ* 231); *ἔμμι(ν)* seventeen times; *ἔμμε* (*Il. Ψ* 412; *Od. ν* 357, σ 407, ω 109).

⁶ *Od. ρ* 221.

⁷ *Il. N* 103, P 20, Φ 573.

⁸ 'Αλκί (*Od. ζ* 130), ἄλλυδης (*Od. ε* 71, 369), ἄμυδης, ὕπαιθα (five times in the *Iliad* alone), ἐπασσύτεροι (always after the first trochee, *Il. A* 383; *Od. π* 366, &c.), ἀχεύων, ἀπουράς, δέω (by the side of the Ionic δέω), ἔμμεναι (instead of the Ionic εἵμεναι, forty times in *Il.*, twenty-one times in *Od.*), ἐγρήγορθαι, ἐκίχημεν.

⁹ *Il. N* 127.

¹⁰ *Il. E* 197.

¹¹ *Il. Γ* 179, P 588; *Od. β* 19.

This has also been the case in ἡύρα for ἀύρα.¹ The later Ionic poets, forgetting the origin of the form, identified its termination with that of the accusative in -α, and hence we find εὐρύοπα used as an accusative in Il. A 498, Θ 206, Ξ 265, Ο 152, Ω 98, 331. The grammarians of Alexandria carried the misconception still further, and Priscian and the Scholiasts lay down that such words are indeclinable and may be used in any case whatever.

The inferences to be drawn from these facts are irresistible. Æolic lays form the background of those Ionic poems which we call Homer. It was among the cities of Æolis, in that very Trojan land in which the scene of the Iliad is laid, that the Greek Epic first grew up. From the hands of Æolic bards it passed into those of their Ionic neighbours, but carrying with it memorials and evidences of its origin. Epithets and phrases that had become part of the rhapsodist's stock-in-trade were interwoven into the Ionic versions of the old lays; the proper names and the legends attached to them were handed on to the new schools of Homeridæ; and here and there an Æolic word or form was retained where it suited the metre better than its Ionic equivalent. Philology thus confirms the tradition which made Smyrna the birthplace of Homer and the earliest seat of Homeric poetry, and is confirmed in its turn by the subject-matter of the Iliad which localises the 'tale divine' of ancient Aryan mythology in the Troad. It was there that the Æolic fugitives from the Dorians had to wrest a new home for themselves from the hands of its Asiatic possessors.

But Æolisms are not the only alien elements that we find in Homer. There is an Attic colouring in the poems as well. So strong, indeed, is the latter that Aristarchus held Homer to have been an Athenian, and Cobet considers the poems to have been partially Atticised.

We must, of course, be on our guard against assuming too hastily that a form is Attic because it occurs in Attic writers and not in the Ionic of Herodotus. Attic is an offshoot of the Ionic dialect; Old Attic may be regarded as a sister of Old Ionic; and it would only be natural to find

¹ *Il.* H 384.

many archaic forms in New Attic which have been lost even in Old Ionic. It does not follow that they did not exist in Old Ionic. The form ἀνέωγε, for example, is not an Atticism, but an Old Ionicism. Only those forms and words must be accounted Atticisms which can be shown by Comparative Philology to have grown up subsequently to the separation of the Attic from the remaining Ionic dialects. Forms originating in phonetic decay or false analogy which are not found in New Ionic are Attic peculiarities, the growth and creation of Attic soil; but no others. Genuine Atticisms, however, exist in abundance in both Iliad and Odyssey. Thus we have the accusatives Τυδῆϊ,¹ Μηκιστῇ,² Ὀδυσῇ,³ like ἱερῇ in Euripides;⁴ θεά used about 200 times in place of the older θεός; νῶ occurring twice, σφῶ once, σφῶν once,⁵ and σφισι fifty-five times; contracted futures like κτενεί, τελεί and κομιῶ, ἀγλαϊεῖσθαι;⁶ heterogen aorists like ἔπεσον; and optatives like ἐπισχοίης with ο instead of ε, and the termination dropped in the third person singular⁷ (ὑπέρσχοι for ὑπερσχοιη[τ]).⁸ Were we to listen to Professor Paley, the list of Atticisms might not only be largely extended, but also be referred to the language of the Periklean age. Among the Atticisms he quotes we find such phrases as ὅτε μεν—ὅτε δέ; οἱ ἀμφὶ Πρίαμον,⁹ παραβάλλεσθαι ψυχὴν,¹⁰ ποιεῖσθαι παῖδα in the sense of 'adopting,'¹¹ ἐπὶ δώρων, 'while gifts last,'¹² like μάχης ἐπὶ,¹³ περιδύσθαι τινος, 'to wager,'¹⁴ δεῖπνεῖν ἐν ὥρῃ, 'to take an early dinner,'¹⁵ ἐκείνοι, in the sense of 'the enemy,'¹⁶ μὴ ὥφελλε γενέσθαι,¹⁷ ὁ αὐτός,¹⁸ a phrase which

¹ *Il.* Δ 384.² *Il.* Ο 339.³ *Od.* τ 136.⁴ *Alk.* 25. Compare Aristoph. *Acharn.* 1150.⁵ *Od.* δ 62.⁶ *Il.* Ο 65, Τ 104; Δ 161, *Od.* ψ 284; *Il.* Β 389, Υ 140, Κ 331, Α 232, Ι 132, 274, Φ 373, *Od.* μ 230, υ 229; *Il.* Κ 331, Λ 454, Σ 133; *Od.* ο 546. The contracted futures in -ῶ, -ιοῦμαι, however, occur eleven times in Herodotus.⁷ See *Il.* Ι 284, 142, Ξ 241; *Il.* Α 838. Herodotus, however, has ἐνέοι (vii. 6).⁸ *Od.* ξ 184; *Il.* Ξ 107; *Od.* ρ 317.⁹ *Il.* Γ 146.¹⁰ *Il.* Ι 322.¹¹ *Il.* Ι 495.¹² *Il.* Ι 602.¹³ *Il.* Ρ 368.¹⁴ *Il.* Ψ 485; *Od.* ψ 78.¹⁵ *Od.* ρ 176.¹⁶ *Il.* Σ 188.¹⁷ *Il.* Ρ 686.¹⁸ *Il.* Ζ 391; *Od.* η 55, 326, &c.

certainly has a very modern ring about it. Equally striking are some of his instances of single words, as, for example, καταδρομοβορῆσαι, where κατα has its peculiarly Attic sense,¹ ἐπέδωκε in the sense given to it by Attic law,² ἀνάξουσθαι with the meaning of 'reckoning,'³ ἐθελοντῆρες,⁴ ζύνετο,⁵ αἶρ in the sense of 'air,' not, as in Old Ionic, of 'mist,'⁶ ἄλλοτε for ἐνίστε, σπουδῇ for μόλις, αἰκῶς for ἀεικῶς,⁷ ἐπίτηδες, ἀμόθεν, ἄσσυ,⁸ δῆσεν for ἐδέησεν,⁹ γενναῖως in the sense of 'legitimate,'¹⁰ ἀλλοῖος, ὄσακας, σκότιος 'illegitimate,'¹¹ ἐπιδοῦναι,¹² and ἐπάλξεσι.¹³ The use of the old demonstrative pronoun as an article also points to a comparatively late date,¹⁴ and the same conclusion may be drawn from verbal forms in -άζειν and -ίζειν, like παππάζειν, μετοκλάζειν, οἰνοποτάζειν, νευστάζειν and δικάζειν (which reminds us of the Athenian law-courts), or ἐρατίζειν, ἀτίζειν, κελητίζειν, ἀλεγίζειν, μεγαλίζεσθαι.¹⁵ Perhaps Mr. Paley goes too far when he claims a philosophic origin for such Homeric verbs as ἀφραίνειν, δειλαίνειν, μωραίνειν, χαλεπαίνειν, μωργαίνειν, ὀρμαίνειν, θαυμαίνειν, μενεαίνειν, κυδαίνειν, though we should have expected to meet with them in Theophrastus, rather than in Old Ionic poems addressed to a popular audience.

It is not difficult to account for this Attic colouring. Some of the Atticisms are probably due to the belief of Aristarchus in the Attic birth of Homer; indeed, we know that in certain passages where he adopted an Attic form the readings of Zenodotus were different. Others, again, may be explained by early errors on the part of copyists. But the greater number admits of but one interpretation. The Homeric poems, as we have them, must have passed through Attic hands, and undergone an Attic recension. Nor is this at variance with what we know of their history. The pseudo-Platonic *Hipparchus* ascribes to Hipparchus an edition or redaction of Homer which later writers, Cicero, Josephus and Pausanias, ascribe to Peisistra-

¹ *Il.* ζ 301.² *Il.* I 148.³ *Od.* γ 245.⁴ *Od.* β 292.⁵ *Od.* δ 76.⁶ *Il.* ζ 288.⁷ *Il.* x 336.⁸ *Il.* κ 208, &c.⁹ *Il.* ζ 100.¹⁰ *Il.* ε 253.¹¹ *Il.* z 24.¹² *Il.* ψ 559.¹³ *Il.* x, 3.¹⁴ As in *Il.* Γ 55, Z 201, K 11, ζ 10, T 320, Φ 526, X 59, Ψ 295.¹⁵ [The old verb μηδίζειν disproves this.—M.]

tus. We cannot suppose that the public library Peisistratus founded was without copies of Homer, or that when one of his editors was convicted of altering and interpolating documents so sacred as the Oracles of Musæus,¹ the old epic literature would have been treated more reverently. Solon is accused of inserting certain passages in Homer in order to glorify the Athenians, and this accusation of itself implies a consciousness of the Attic origin of some parts of the poems. It is not impossible that Mr. Paley may be right in referring some of the Atticisms he has enumerated to so late a period as the Periclean age, since it is hard to see in Od. η 81 an allusion to any other building than the Erechtheum, which was erected about the year 432 B.C. At any rate there is plain proof that the Homeric poems underwent a process of manipulation in Attica; at how late or early a time this process terminated must remain undecided.

It must now be quite clear that the language of the poems is an artificial one, a sort of curious mosaic in which archaisms and modernisms, fragments of Æolic, Attic and Ionic are embedded side by side. It testifies to slow growth among guilds of professional poets who received from their predecessors a series of stock subjects, a stock mode of treating them, and a body of traditional words and phrases. This fact is confirmed—though further confirmation is not needful—by the occurrence in Homer of words and forms which are the product of false analogy, and owe their existence to the misinterpretation of the older part of the Homeric language.

Reference has been already made to some of these, and, indeed, so numerous are the examples of such erroneous formations in Homer, that it is easy to find illustrations of them. In some cases we can actually see the process of creation, as it were, going on. Thus in Od. η 95 we read: ἐν δὲ θρόνοι περὶ τοῖχον ἐρηρέδατ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα. Here ἐρήρεδατο is a perfectly normal Ionic formation from the root of ἐρεῖδω; the dental belongs to the root, and accordingly appears in all the other tenses of the verb. But a few lines before (86) we have another verse, which is evidently formed on the model of the

¹ See Hdt. vii. 6.

one just quoted, and only differs from the latter half of it in substituting ἐληλέδατο for ἐρηρέδατο. Ἐληλέδατο, however, is etymologically and grammatically an impossible form; the present tense is ἐλαύνω and the root is *lav*, with no trace of either a dental or a vowel ε. The word, in fact, is due to the false analogy of ἐρηρέδατο and the misunderstanding of the archaic pluperfect form. In the *Odyssey*,¹ again, we find a verse which can only be explained as the creation of false analogy. The translation, 'seals, the offspring of the sea-foam,' gives a radically wrong sense to both νέποδες and ἀλοσύδνη. The last word is a compound of ἄλς and συνδή, an old Ionic feminine, answering to a Sanskrit *sun-ya* (from the root *su*, 'to beget'), and signifying 'daughter' or 'offspring.' The Sanskrit *sun-ya* (by the side of the masculine *sunus*, 'son') would have been represented in Old Ionic by *συνγη*, but the *yo* after first developing a dental, as is so frequently the case in Greek, disappeared, leaving *συνδη*, and by metathesis *συνδή*. Some early 'Homeric' verse, now lost, must have once existed in which the seals were called νέποδες ἀλόσυνδναι, 'footless offspring of the sea,' νέποδες (or rather νήποδες)² being a compound of ποῦς and the same negative that we meet with in νηκερδής or the Latin *nefas*. The second part of the epithet, however, came to be misinterpreted; ἀλοσύδνη was divided into the genitive ἄλως, and the non-existent *υδνη*, which the rhapsodists connected with ὕδωρ and ὑδαρής, and the change of meaning was complete. It only remained to explain νέποδες, which, now that its substantive had been turned into a genitive, necessarily signified 'offspring,' and this was easily done by referring it to ἀνέψιος. The superfluous dental did not trouble the etymological consciences of the Homeric poets. It is probable that this passage of the *Odyssey* was not the only place in Homeric literature in which the mistaken use of νέποδες occurred, since we find both Kallimachus³ and Theokritus⁴ employing the word in the same sense.

¹ δ 404 : ἀμφὶ δέ μιν φῶκαι νέποδες καλῆς ἀλοσύδνης.

² The shortened form would belong to the New Ionic period.

³ ὁ Κεῖος Ὑλλίχου νέπους.

αντι. 25 : ἀθάνατοι δὲ καλεῦντα ἐοὶ νέποδες

Two other instances of false analogy may be quoted, which will show even more clearly the artificial character of the Homeric dialect. In Il. Z 289 the loss of the digamma caused some rhapsodist or scribe to alter the original phrase *πέπλοι, παμποίκιλα φέργα γυναικῶν* into *πέπλοι παμποίκιλοι, ἔργα γυναικῶν*, and this corrupt reading has been imitated by the author of Od. ο 105, where we have *πέπλοι παμποίκιλοι, οὗς κίμεν αὐτή*. A similar blunder occurs in Il. Ω 6, a verse, it is fair to state, which was rejected by Aristophanes and Aristarchus themselves. Here the impossible form *ἀνδροτήτα* originates in the corrupt reading of Il. Π 857 and X 363, where Clemm has restored *ἐροτήτα* (for *νδροτήτα* as *ἐρῶψ* for *νδρῶψ*).

Perhaps one of the oddest of these new creations of the Homeric poets is the adjective *ἴος*, 'one,' in Il. Z 422.¹ From the root *σεμ*, the Greeks had formed a numeral 'one,' which was declined in the nominative *σεμς*, *σεμια*, *σεμ*. By the ordinary phonetic laws of the language these finally became *εἷς*, *μία* (for *σμία*), *ἐν*, and in epic *μία* sometimes lost its initial consonant like some other words (e.g. *λείβω*, *γαῖα*). Then came the misconception of later composers. The feminine *ῖα* was supposed to be an adjective declined like *τίμος*, and hence the monstrous *ἰῶ* instead of *ἐνί*.

The intensive *ὄχα* has arisen in much the same way. The root of *ἔχω* could never of itself have passed into the meaning given to *ὄχα*; it was only in combination with *ἐξ* (as in *ἐξέχω*) that it was able to acquire an intensive or superlative sense. But there must have been some passage or passages in which the rhapsodists divided the compound *ἔξοχα* in an incorrect way, assigning *ἐξ* to the verb of the sentence by supposing that in the obsolete dialect of early Ionia *ὄχα* alone meant 'very.' Hence the numerous passages in which it is used in this sense. If Mr. Paley is right, *ὑπέρμωρα*² has had a similar origin, being formed after the analogy of such Attic compounds as *παρίλογος* or *ἀνάλογον*.

The same scholar has pointed out a passage³ in which the

¹ οἱ μὲν πάντες ἰῶ κίον ἱματι Ἀϊδος εἶσω.

² Il. B 155.

³ Il. K 466 : δέελον δ' ἐπὶ σῆμα τ' ἔθηκεν.

adjective δέελον (=δῆλον) is used as if it were a substantive with the meaning of 'mark.' This mistake could only have been made after the contraction of the original δέελος through δέλως into the New Ionic δῆλος and a forgetfulness that the two words were really the same.¹ Another example of the same kind is the use of ἀγγελίης, the genitive of ἀγγελίη, as a masculine nominative meaning 'messenger.'² A passage must have occurred in the traditionary lays in which the form of the sentence rendered the blunder possible, and since the primitive *alpha* of the termination had already become *êta*, the passage in question would have been of later date than the separation of the Attic dialect from the Ionic stock.³ Other instances of similar blundering that may be quoted are the confusion of χέρηα, the accusative of the substantive χέρης, with the comparative χρεῖονα,⁴ and the use of πλέες, 'full,' as πλείονες,⁵ 'more.'

Of a somewhat different character are the false presents εἶκω, πεφεύγω, ἰνώγω, πεφρίδω, &c. from the perfects εἶκα (=ἔοικα), πέφευγα, ἰνωγα, πέφραδα, which had come to be employed in a present sense, or the false futures χραισμήσω, πεπιθήσω, ἐνισπήσω (like ἰδήσω in Theoc. 3, 37) from the aorist infinitives χραισμεῖν, πεπιθεῖν, ἐνισπεῖν, &c., which were confounded with the present infinitives of contracted verbs in -έω. The contraction they imply indicates the late date at which they were coined, and they point to a belief that the forms of the Epic dialect were so far removed from those of the dialect of everyday life as to admit among them almost any new coinage which suited the metre and had an archaic ring.

¹ Δέελον is the same word as the second part of the compound epithet εὐ-δέιελος, where we ought certainly to read εὐ-δῆελος. In the latter, however, the first syllable remains long by way of compensating for the loss of the digamma, whereas in δέελον it has been shortened in accordance with the usual habit of New Ionic.

² *Il.* Γ 206, Ν 252, Ο 640.

³ Since the Attic dialect retains the original *alrha*.

⁴ *Il.* Δ 400.

⁵ *Il.* Β 129, Α 395 : τόσσον ἐγὼ φημι πλέας ἔμμεναι υἱας Ἀχαιῶν Τρώων· οἰωνοὶ δὲ περὶ πλέες ἦν γυναῖκες.

To the same belief must be ascribed many of the other products of false analogy in Homer. Thus nineteen aorist infinitives in -εειν which stand for -εγειν are found in the poems¹ which are erroneously formed after the model of the uncontracted present infinitives of verbs in -εω. Curtius has shown from a comparison of the forms of the infinitive in Ionic, Doric, and Æolic that φέρειν represents an original φερε-φειν, which in Ionic became successively φερεεν and φέρειν (for φερεῖν), so that the first ε of the Homeric forms in -εειν is historically false.² Thus, again, the futures ἀνύω from ἀνύτω,³ ἐρύω,⁴ and ἐντανύω,⁵ are modelled upon the Atticising futures of verbal stems in -s, which primitively had a double sigma in this tense, afterwards in New Ionic dropped one of them, and finally lost both. Thus, too, the form διδοῖσθα,⁶ from the root *da*, is a mere imitation of οἶσθα for οἰδ-θα from the root *vid*, the sibilant being erroneously imagined to be part of the second person ending in the archaic Epic dialect;⁷ the compounds ιθαίγενής,⁸ γυναιμανής,⁹ are due to the analogy of Θηβαιγενής, where alone the locative Θηβαι is right; and the so-called diectasis or resolution of vowels, which is so frequently resorted to for helping out the metre, has been proved by Mangold and Wackernagel's researches to be an affected archaism. Ἐλώωσι, for example, in *Il.* N 315, *Od.* η 319, is a false resolution of the contracted ἐλῶσι of Herodotus, κρεμῶω, in *Il.* H 83, of the κρεμῶμεν which we find in the *Plutus*¹⁰ of Aristophanes. Forms like γανώωσαι, ἡβῶντες, ὀρόωτε, γοόωντα, αἰτιόωντο, ἄλώω, πρῶ-οιες and θῶωκος are grammatically and phonetically impossible. According to the phonetic laws of the Ionic dialect, the middle stage between ὀράω and ὀρῶ is ὀρέω, not ὀρόω, and the theory of an assimilation of the vowels is set aside by the invariable usage of Ionic authors and of the Epic dialect itself,

¹ Ex. gr. *Il.* Δ 263, Σ 511, Τ 15, Ψ 467, Ω 608; *Od.* α 59, ε 349, ι 137, λ 232, μ 446, τ 477, χ 437.

² The infinitive in -εειν is found thrice in Hesiod's *Shield*; never in the *Works and Days*, or in the elegiac writers.

³ *Il.* Δ 56, Λ 365.

⁴ *Il.* Λ 454, Ο 351, Χ 67.

⁵ *Od.* φ 97, 127, 174.

⁶ *Il.* Τ 270.

⁷ Similarly we find ἔχεισθα and φίλεισθα in Sappho, which made the grammarians fancy the form to be an Æolic one.

⁸ *Od.* ξ 203.

⁹ *Il.* Γ 39.

¹⁰ v. 312

except in the limited number of cases under consideration. Moreover, *ov* and *η* could not become *ω*, much less could *ο* do so. The whole set of forms is the creation of rhapsodists and scribes endeavouring to restore the metre of lines which the contraction of two short syllables, the loss of the digamma, or the decay of some other peculiarity of early pronunciation, had violated, and who looked for the means of effecting this to the supposed analogy of other old words.

If further proof is wanted of the artificial nature of the Homeric dialect, it would be found in two facts. The first of these is that the parallel forms of various date and origin which coexist in the poems are generally of different metrical quantity, and accordingly highly convenient for the verse-maker's purposes. Thus the *Æolic* *ἔμμεναι* serves as a dactyl, *ἔμμεναι* as an anapæst, *ἔμμεν* as a trochee, *ἔμμεν* as a pyrrhic, and *εἶναι* as a spondee, and it is plainly metrical necessities that have preserved the *Æolic* forms of the personal pronouns. The second fact is that short syllables are lengthened where too many come together to allow the word in which they occur to be otherwise used in the hexameter. Hence it is that the first syllable of *ἀθάνατος* is always long, that *ὑψηρέφους* is the genitive of *ὑψηρέφης*, that *ἄορ* has *ᾱ* in dissyllabic forms and *ā* in trisyllabic ones, and that we find indifferently *ἀπειρέσιος* and *ἀπερείσιος*, *μέλανι* and *μεῖλανι*.¹ Hence, too, we find *κῦανος*, *κῦανόπρωρος*, and *κῦανῶπις*, but *κῦάνεος*, *κῦανόπεζα*, *κῦανόπεπλος*, and *κῦανο-χυίτης*.²

The long vowels and diphthongs by which the lengthened quantity of these naturally short syllables is pointed out in writing are due to the scribes, and are probably of late date. How modern the manuscripts were which Aristarchus had before him is shown, as Giese has remarked, by his uncertainty regarding the insertion of the aspirate except where it was indicated by an elision. The alterations made in the text by the scribes both of the Alexandrine and of an earlier period were numerous and sometimes revolutionary. No doubt of this can

¹ *Il.* Ω 79.

² So, also, *σύβοσια* (*Od.* ξ 101), *ἄπονέεσθαι*, *ἡπερο-πέω* (Sanskrit *ṛpṛāṇ*), *ἡνεμόεις*, *διηνεκῆς*, *εἰλάτινος*, *θεμέλια* (*Il.* Ψ 255), *εἰανός* (*Il.* Π 9), *ἀγνοιῆσι* (*Od.* ω 218), *εἰαιινός*, *εἰρεσίη*, *ἁκάματος*, &c.

remain after the labours of Nauck, Cobet, and Wackernagel. The hiatus caused by the loss of the digamma was mended in various ways. Sometimes *ο'* is inserted,¹ sometimes *τ'*,² sometimes *τε*,³ sometimes *δ'*,⁴ sometimes *γ'* or *γε*,⁵ sometimes *κ'*.⁶ At other times the plural takes the place of the dual (as Il. γ 371, 372, for *χεῖρε φέβοικε*), or the vocative the place of the nominative used vocatively, as in Il. γ 277.⁷ New forms, again, are substituted for older ones, as in Il. N 107, where Zenodotus and Aristophanes preserve the older reading *νῦν δὲ ἕκας πόλιος* corrupted into *νῦν δ' ἕκαθεν πόλιος* in the MSS. of Aristarchus, and the words of a verse may even be transposed or changed, as when⁸ *στῆ δὲ πάροιθ' ἵππων δηδισκόμενος* is turned into *στῆ δ' ἵππων προπάροιθε· δεδισκόμενος* or *τοῖονδε φῖδον* into *τοιοῦτον ἴδον*.⁹ A frequent source of error has been the contraction of short syllables during the age of Attic influence, resulting in various corruptions of the text in order to restore the violated metre. Equally frequent has been the misreading of the older MSS. in which E represented both *η* and *ει* as well as *ε*, and O *ω* and *ου* as well as *ο*. But it must be remembered that it is often far from easy to distinguish false forms which have arisen from the mistakes of the later copyists and critics from those which belonged to the older period of oral recitation. In many cases we shall never be able to determine with accuracy whether we are dealing with a corruption of the written text or with a product of the age before the poems were first written down.

About one point, however, there need be no hesitation. Throughout the whole of Homer words which in Doric have *κ* from an original *kz* (Latin *qu*) appear with *π*, never *κ*. Thus we find *ὄπως*, *πῶς*, *ποῦ*, *ποῖ*, &c. Yet we know both from inscriptions and the MSS. of Kallinos, Mimnermus, and He-

¹ Il. B 342, Δ 467.

² Il. E 467, Ξ 348; Od. φ 401.

³ Il. I 379, M 162; Od. α 41, ο 507.

⁴ Il. Δ 509, Λ 792, M 412, O 403; Od. β 332, γ 216, δ 556.

⁵ Il. A 548; Od. σ 233.

⁶ Il. A 64, T 250.

⁷ An instance is quoted by Hoffmann from Il. B 8, where for *οὔλε* *δνειρε* we should read *οὔλος*.

⁸ Od. ο 150.

⁹ Od. ζ 160.

rodotus, that the New Ionic still preserved the older κ up to the fourth century B.C. It is difficult to ascribe the change of spelling to the Atticising influence discussed above, since the latter would not well explain the thoroughness with which the change has been carried out. The change is rather the work of the copyists of a later day, influenced, no doubt, by the theory that Homer was of Attic birth. Quite parallel is the appearance of an aspirated letter in many words which retained the simple *tenuis* in the Ionic of Herodotus and the inscriptions. An instance of this is $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ in the place of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$.

The conclusions to be derived from a close examination of the language of the Iliad and the Odyssey make it almost superfluous to refer to the question whether these two works were the production of one author or of two. Since, however, the question is even now keenly debated, it is as well to see what light can be thrown upon it by the language of the poems. Though this has shown us that the national Epic of ancient Greece, like the national Epics of all other peoples—the Mahâbhârata of India, the Edda of Scandinavia, the Nibelungen Lied of Germany, the Kalevala of the Finns—grew up slowly and gradually, passing through the mouths of numberless generations and schools of poets and reciters, and assuming new forms among each; nevertheless there must have been definite individuals to whom the arrangement and grouping of this traditional matter was due, to whom, in fact, the Iliad and the Odyssey, the *Thebais* and the *Kypria*, the Lesser Iliad and the other specimens of Epic literature, as separate poems, owed their origin. We know that the last line of the Iliad is but the protasis of which the first line of the *Æthiopis* formed the apodosis, and that the poet of the Odyssey¹ appeals to the Muses to relate to him ‘also’ as to others who had gone before the adventures of the Greek heroes on their return from Troy. It is plain, therefore, that some principle was adopted in cutting off one portion of the mass of Epic matter from another, in throwing it, that is to say, into the shape of a single independent poem. But a merely superficial reading will convince most people that there is a very decided difference of tone and

¹ a. 10. The neglect of the digamma in this line should be noted.

manner between the Iliad and the Odyssey, that the Odyssey is a much more artificial composition than the Iliad, and breathes the spirit of a more modern age. And this impression is borne out by differences in the language of the two poems. There are about 130 words found only in the Iliad, and about 120 found only in the Odyssey, and among the latter occur not only abstract nouns like σπέρμα, χρῆμα, μορφή, ἀριθμός, εὐχή, γαλήνη,¹ but words which denote a distinct advance in wealth and luxury, such as δημίουργος, δέσποινα, κοῖτος, ἤλεκτρον. The usage of certain words, too, differs in the two poems, implying that a different hand has manipulated the old traditionary materials in the two cases. Thus different epithets are employed for the same object, or, what is more significant, the same epithet is employed in different senses. Δαίφρων and ὀλοόφρων, for instance, are 'baleful' in the Iliad, 'crafty' in the Odyssey, εὐκυκλος is used only of the shield with the meaning of 'round' in the Iliad, of the chariot with the meaning of 'well-wheeled' in the Odyssey. Similarly βουλήφορος is an epithet of princes in the Iliad, of the ἀγορά in the more democratic Odyssey. So, too, the same word has different significations. In the Iliad κλείς is 'a collar-bone'; ζώστηρ 'a warrior's belt'; λόφος, 'a neck'; ἡγεμών, 'a chief'; μῶλος, 'the moil of war'; ἔρις, 'the battle-strife'; καλέω, 'to call'; κοσμέω, 'to marshal.' In the Odyssey the same words mean 'key,' 'swine-herd's belt,' 'ridge,' 'guide,' 'struggle,' 'rivalry,' 'invite,' and 'to set huntsmen'; the accusative of ἔρις in the latter poem being the analogic ἔριν of the Attic dialect. Differences, again, appear in the use even of words like ἐξοπίσω, which always denotes *place* in the Iliad, *time* in the Odyssey, or in the expression of an idea like that of the preposition 'by means of,' which is represented by ἐκ- in the Iliad, by ἰότητι in the Odyssey (and Iliad). It is, perhaps, of little moment that the later analogic comparative of φίλος, φίλτερος, is found only once in Odyssey, φιλίων being alone employed in the Odyssey; but, on the other hand, we cannot overlook the significance of the fact that the contracted form of παρὰ, πάρ, occurs before the

¹ So οὔνομα, which frequently appears in the Odyssey, is found only twice in the Iliad (Γ 235, Π 260).

letters γ , ζ , ξ , σ and τ only in the Iliad, and before κ and μ only in the Odyssey. We seem here referred to a difference of usage on the part of the poet or redactor, or whatever else we choose to term him, which points further to a difference of personality. Whether or not, however, the author of the Iliad and of the Odyssey was one and the same individual is of small consequence; in any case he has been proved by the sure evidence of philology to have been but the inheritor of other men's labours, and, like Castrén and Lönnroth in our own age, to have worked up the materials provided by the spirit and genius of a whole nation. It was to this spirit and genius that the old Epic of Greece was due, and rightly, therefore, was its creation named Homêros, 'the fitted together.'¹

¹ "Ομηρος is actually used with this sense by Euripides (*Alc.* 870), who applies it to the marriage bond. The form of the name, and probably its origin also, is Ionic. The word is first found in a doubtful fragment (xxxiv.) of Hesiod. The statement of the pseudo-Herodotean Life of Homer that the word signified 'blind' in the Cumæan dialect must be a pure fiction. G. Curtius and Angermann take a slightly different view of the original use of the word from that adopted in the text. The former says:—'Sic fere nomen Homeri esse existimaverim, ut primum poetæ inter se conjuncti et apti ὄμηροι vocati sint, ii deinde gentis sodalitis inito patronymicum Ὀμηρίδαι nomen acceperint, postea vero ex civilium gentium more eponymus quidam inventus sit Ὀμηρος, qui gentis potius quam suam personam sustineret. Nam similem sane in modum qui a cantu εὐμολποι vocati erant facti sunt Εὐμολπίδαι, Eumolpidarum autem auctor inventus est Eumolpus. Fiet igitur Homerus nobis auctor vel eponymus poetarum gentilicia communione inter se conjunctorum *Ahn herr der Sängerrinnungen*.

INDEX TO PART I.

ABE

- A** BEL, 249
 Abu Simbel inscription, 27
Achilleis, 54 sq., 86
 Achilles, 19, 103
 Acusilaus, 132
 Adonis, 14
 Ælian, 177, 222
 Æneas, 149
 Æolic forms in Homer discussed, 68-69, 71
 Æolic school of poetry, 198
 Æschines (orator), 33
 Æschylus, 15, 32, 58, 110, 124, 214, 240, 246
 Æsop, 109, 110, 111
Æthiopsis, 103
 Agamemnon, 74, 87
 Agathocles (flute-player), 234
 Agias of Troezen, 103
 Ahrens, 188
Alymuos, 130
 Alcæus (of Lesbos), 27, 70, 115, 132, 193, 198 sq.
 Alcæus (of Messene), 137
 Alcibiades, 234
 Alcman, 31, 184, 185, 188-192, 202, 204, 221
 — his papyrus fragment cited, 188 sq.
 Aldus, 41, 43
 Alexander the Great, 209, 226, 235
 Alexandrian school, 35 sq.
 Alexandrine epoch, 7
 Alkidamas, 23, 134, 135
 Althorp library, 109
 Amazons, 19
 Ambrosian MSS. (of *Odyssev*), 42
 Ameis (ed. *Odyssey* and *Theocrius*), 43
 Animonius, 31
 Amphidamas, 113, 115, 117

ARI

- Anacreon, 173, 193, 203, 217 sq., 227, 228
 Anacreontics (false), 7, 219
 Ananias, 216
 Anaxagoras, 32, 143
 Andromache, 20, 50
 Antimachus (of Teos), 104
 Antimachus (of Colophon), 22, 31, 33, 35, 57, 162, 163, 213
 Antimenidas, 27, 199
 Antiochus of Syracuse, 97-8
 Antiphanes, 9
Antisigma, 37
 Antisthenes (cynic), 33
 Aphrodite, ode to (in Eurip. *Phaethon*), 20
 Apion, 40
 Apollodorus (flute-player), 234
 Apollonius (Rhodius), 7, 33, 35, 128, 132, 163 sq., 190, 239
 Apollonius (Sophista), 40
 Aratus (poet), 33, 35
 Archias, founder of Syracuse, 98
 Archilochus, 15, 24, 31, 70, 74, 76, 103, 110, 112, 115, 131, 173, 174 sq., 198, 201, 216, 221
 Archytas, 189
 Arctinus, 67, 74, 95, 103, 105
Ἀργολικά, 130
Argonautica of Apollonius, citations from, 166
 Argos, the Boeotian, 235
 Arion, 203, 221 sq.; fragment cited, 222
 Ariphron, 253
 Aristarchus, 25, 33, 35 sq., 203
 Aristeas' *Ἀριμάσπεια*, 131
 Aristonicus (grammaticus), 39
 Aristophanes (of Byzantium), 36, 37, 38, 40, 59, 128, 131, 203

ARI

- Aristophanes (comicus), 40, 110
 Aristotle, 10 (on Orphic poems), 17,
 (on Peisistratus), 28, 31, 33 (Ho-
 meric studies), 40, 76, 80, 99, 104,
 105 (on the Cyclic poets), 119, 121
 (on Stesichorus), 135, 140, 196, 213,
 253
 Aristoxenus, 180, 236
 Arnold, Mr. M., 44, 144
 Artemisia, 106
 Artemon, 218
 Ascrea, 114
 Asius (epicus), 130, 161
 Asterisk (as critical mark), 37
 Athenæus, 78, 102, 161, 189, 195, 217,
 253
 Athenagoras, 216
 Athenio, the sculptor, 216
 Ἀθήνησις, 36, 38
 Ἀθητική and ἀλφεική, 186
 Autenrieth, 43

B

- BABRIUS, III, 216
 Bacchylides, 31, 250 sq. ; cited,
 251
 Bacon, Lord, 144
 Bakis, 14
 Barnes, J., 43
Batrachomyomachia, 106 sq.
 Baumeister, 106, 108, 109, 148, 159
 Baumlein, 59
 Bekker, 41, 43, 212
 Bellerophon, 19
 Bergier, 137
 Bergk, Theodor (*Hist. Greek Lit.*),
 5, 12, 14, 17, 20, 26, 27 (on Homer),
 50, 51, 59, 60, 61, 78, 112, 118
 (FLG.), 174, 179, 181, 187, 191, 202,
 209, 211, 212, 213, 215, 217, 219,
 220, 225, 231, 233, 234, 236, 240,
 249, 253
 Bernays, J., 44
 Bernhardt (*Hist. Greek Lit.*), 5, 17,
 29, 50, 105, 132, 181, 252
 Bias, 197, 211, 223
 Bible of the Greeks, Homer, 34
 Bindseil, H., 249 (concordance of
 Pindar)
 Blackie, Prof. J. S., 45
 Blass, Dr. F., 181, 191, 202
 Boeckh, 234, 235, 236, 249
 Boehme, 144
 Bœotia, 112
 Bœotian School of Hesiod, 26
 Boissonade, 111
 Bonitz, 51, 61, 62, 92

CIR

- Bothe, 109
 Brandreth, 45
 Brevia (or Didymic) Scholia on
 Homer, 41
 Brunk, 213
 Bucolic poetry, 5, 7
 Bunbury, Mr. (Geography of An-
 cients), 97
 Bupalus, the sculptor, 216
 Burnouf, Émile, 11, 92, 127, 200
 Bury, Mr., 240, 249
 Busolt (*Griech. Gesch.*), 97
 Butcher, Mr. (trans. *Odyssey*), 44, 45
 Buttman, 42
 Byron, 110, 170

C

- CADMEAN Letters, 11
 Caligula, depreciated Homer,
 34
 Callimachus, 7, 102, 111, 154, 163,
 164, 215, 240
 Callinus, 72, 95, 173, 176, 177, 181,
 211
 Callistratus, 37
 Calydon, the boar hunt of, 18
 Calypso, 19
 Camerarius, 43, 212
 Catalogue in the Iliad, 9, 25, 86
 Catalogue of Women, 18
 Cavalotti, Felix (ed. Tyrtæus), 181
 Centaurs, 19
Centones Homerici, 170
 Cercops, 74, 130, 132
 Chalcondylas, 43
 Chapman, 44, 45, 109, 137
 Chappell, Mr. Wm. (*History of
 Music*), 175, 183, 187
 Characters of the Iliad, 2
 Charaxus, 199
 Charites of Orchomenos, 12
 Charops, 14
Χέλωνος ὑποθήκαι, 131
 Chersias, 130
 Chian Hymn to Apollo, 25
 Chilo, 223
 Chios, 78
 Choerilus (epicus), 163
 Choragic monuments, 151
Chorizontes, on Homer, 36-8, 81
 Christ (ed. *Iliad*), 43, 67 sq., 76, 235
 Christopoulos, 45
 Chronology of Sicilian colonies, 96
 Chrysippus, 33, 133
 Chrysothemis, 14
 Cicero, 141
 Circe, 19

CIT

- City editions of Homer, 29, 35
 Clarke, S., 43
 Cleanthes, 33
 Cleaver, W., 181
 Cleisthenes, 26, 223
 Cleobulus, 223
 Clonas of Tegea, 186
 Cobet, 41
 Colluthus, 169
 Colophon, 24
 Comas (tyrant of Ephesus), 216
 Commission to edit Homer, 28
 Common Prayer, Book of, 82, 89
 Composition of Iliad, compared with transmission, 26
 Concordances (Indices) Homeric, 43;
 Hesiodic, 136; Pindaric, 249
 Consent, the argument from, 82
Contest of Homer and Hesiod, 115,
 134
 Cooke (translated Hesiod), 137
 Cookesley, 249
 Coornhorst (trans. *Odyssey*), 44
 Coraes, 111
 Corinna, 234, 252
 Couat, 102, 154
 Cowley, 249, 250
 Cowper, 45
 Cramer, 29
 Crates (grammaticus), 24, 37, 39
 Crates (philosophus), 253
 Cratinus, 6
 Crete, 25, 50
 Critias, 177, 211, 213 (elegies), 219
 — fragment cited, 214
 Critical marks of Aristarchus, 37
 Croiset, A. and M. (*Litt. grecque*), 17,
 20, 26; Homeric theory, 65 sq., 84,
 90, 176; Pindar, 234, 238, 240
 Cunichius, 44
 Cureton, 42
 Curtius, G., 23, 118
 Cyclic poets, 6, 102 sq.
Cyclops (of Eurip.), 32
 Cynæthus, of Chios, 28, 74
Cypria, 32, 74, 80, 102-4
 Cyprus, 25
 Cypselus' chest, 26
- D**ACIER, Madame, 45
 Danae, lament of, quoted, 232
 Dante, 44, 46
 Darwin, 142
 Dates for Homer, 24, 25
 David, Psalms of, 79
 Delphic oracle, 14, 15, 18, 26

EOI

- Demeter's mysteries, 13
 Demetrius, Phalareus, 31, 111
 Demetrius (of Scepsis), 39
 Demetrius Zenas, 109
 Democritus, 33
 Demodocus, 8, 65
 Demosthenes, 33, 34, 121, 196, 213
 Derby, Lord, 45
Διασκεύασται, 22, 50
 Didot, 131
 Didymus (critic), 39
Digamma, the, 136; (Appendix),
 259 sq.
 Dindorf (G.), 41, 42, 43, 102, 111, 129
 Dio Cassius, 57
 Diogenes (Laërtius), 141, 196, 197,
 203, 223
 Diomedes, 87
 Dion Chrysostom, 33
 Dionysius (of Halicarnassus), 97, 204,
 246
 Dionysius ('the Copper'), 213
 Dionysus, worship of, 151, 223
Διπλὴ καθαρὰ and *διπλὴ περιστιγ-*
 μένη, 37
 Dissen, 242, 249
 Dithyramb, 184, 221
 Dithyrambs, 184; of Pindar, 246
Doloneia, 81
 Dolphin (Arion's), 223
 Donaldson, 249
 Donner, 45
 Dryden, 71
 Dübner, 161, 162
 Düntzer, 23, 43, 61, 104, 131

- E**BELING'S *Lexicon Homericum*,
 43
 Echembrotus of Arcadia, 187, 224,
 229
 Eclipse (Pindar's), 247
 Edgar, Mr., 159
 Editions of Homer, 35 sq.
 Egger, 191
 Egypt, Greek religion borrowed from,
 according to Herodotus, 10; MSS.
 found in, 42, 191
Eiresione, 21; cited, 156
 Elegiac poetry, 176
 Eleusis, 13
 Ellis, Mr. (on the *Ibis*), 164
 Elton (translated Hesiod), 137
 Empedocles, 139, 140-144
 Encomia of Helen, 33
 Engelbrecht, 203
Eoiai, 115, 128, 130

EPA

- Epaminondas, 113
 Ephorus, 32
 Epic Poetry, earliest we have, 2;
 was gradually developed, 3; sup-
 planted earlier forms of poetry, 4;
 transformed, not destroyed, by Pin-
 dar, 6; preliminary stages to, 8;
 real beginnings of, 15; epics re-
 ferred to in Homer, 18 sq.
 Epicharmus, 99, 180
 Epicurus, 143
 Epigenes (of Sicyon), 223
Epigoni, 80, 104
 Epigrams, 214, 215, 231
Epigraphik, 2
 Epimenides, 130
 Episodes, in the *Iliad*, 3
 Eratosthenes, 24, 135, 163, 164
 Erechtheus, 13
 Erinna, 199
 Erythræ, 78
Ἐταιραί, 180
 Eudocia, Empress, 170
 Euenus of Paros, 179, 213, 253
 Eugammon (epicus), 103
 Eumelus of Corinth, 118, 130
 Eumolpus, 13, 14, 56, 130
 Euripides, 10, 14, 19, 20, 32, 58, 99,
 143, 165, 196, 209, 214
 Eusebius, 180
 Eustathius, 40, 237
Ἐξ ὑποβολῆς and *ἐξ ὑπολήψεως*, 29

FAESI, 43, 60

- Fawkes' translation of Apollo-
 nius, 168
 Fennel, Mr. C. A. (ed. Pindar), 249
 Fichte, L. (on Homer), 48
 Fick, Aug., 26, 28, 60, 68 (on Homer),
 69 sq., 117, 129, 136, 146, 149, 151,
 159, 172-3, 174, 197, 205
 Fitzgerald, Mr., 233
 Five ages of Man, 119
 Flach, 110, 135, 136, 171 sq., 200,
 208, 209 sq.
 Fortlage, 183
 Frank, 109
 Frere, J. H., *Theognis Restitutus*, 213
 Friedländer, 61
 Fritzsche, 205
 Fulgentius, 108
 Furia, de, 111

GAISFORD, 129, 136, 212

- Gardner, Mr. E., 199

HER

- Gardthausen, 38
 Gascoigne, Geo., 196
 Geddes, Professor, 27, 55-6, 61, 94
 Gelzer (on age of Gyges), 174
 Gemoll, 158, 159
 Genealogical epics in Peloponnesus,
 16
 Genealogies of poets before Homer,
 14
 Geography in *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, 55,
 78, 96 sq.
 Gildersleeve, Dr. (ed. Pindar), 249
 Gin (translated Hesiod), 137
 Giuliani, 109
 Glarstone, Mr. W. E., 45, 52, 53,
 54, 55, 76, 82, 88, 97
 Goethe, 44, 48, 166
Golden Verses, 138
 Gorgias, 134, 141
 Göttling, 114, 122, 129, 134, 136
 Greene's Translation of Apollonius,
 168
 Gr gory VII., 202
 Grote, 52, 54-5 (on Homer), 59, 60,
 63, 65, 90, 94, 117
 Gutschmid, 211
 Gyges, 25, 117, 174, 193

HADRIAN (depreciated Homer),
34

- Hanssen, 220
 Hartel (on Homer), 61
 Hayman (ed. *Odyssey*), 43
 Heber, Bishop, 250
 Hecataeus, 139
 Hector, 19, 20, 50, 87
 Hecuba, 20
 Hegesias and Hegesinus, 102
 Heimreich, 61
 Heinsius, D., 136
 Helen, 20
 Helicon, 13
 Hellanicus, 36, 186
Hemiambics, 217
 Henkel, 44
 Hephæstion, 180
 Heracleitus, 13, 32, 34, 125, 132, 139,
 142, 209
 Heracles, 18, 19
 Hermann, G., 48, 49, 50, 54, 83, 129,
 242
 Hermippus (comedian), 217
 Hermodike, 74
 Herodas, 217, 253
 Herodian (Homeric prosody), 39
 Herodorus (prose epic), 161

HER

Herodotus (on Homer), 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 23, 24, 26, 32, 70, 80, 102, 110, 117, 118, 142, 161 (relation to Panyasis school), 197, 222, 223, 251

Heroes, poems about, 16

Herschel, Sir J., 45

Hesiod, 2, 8, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, 23, 26, 28, 31, 49, 72, 74, 79, 80, 108 (and Æsop), 110, 112 sq., 204, 225

Ἡσίοδος ἢ Ἀντερίνος, 135

Hesychius, 40

Hetzl, J., 123

Hexameters, 15, 20

Heyer, T. L., 123

Heyne, 43

Hiller, 224

Hinrichs, 72

Hipparchus, 28, 218

Hippocrates, 79, 143

Hipponax, 115, 173, 207, 216 sq.

Hobbes, T., 45

Homer, 2, 3, 4, 8-10, 14-21, 22 sq., 70, 71, 73, 76, 105, 106, 118, 119, 129, 133, 156, 162, 173

Homer, derivation of, 23, 283

Homeric Controversy reviewed, English and German methods compared, 62, 63; result of, 94 sq.

Homeridæ at Chios, 28

Horace, 101, 201, 202, 204, 205, 217, 239

Hymenæus, 19, 20

Hymn to Aphrodite, 148; to Hermes, 149; to Demeter, 150; to Delian and Pythian Apollo, 28, 32, 146

Hymns ascribed to Homer, 79 sq., 145 sq.

Hyporcheme, 184

IALEMUS, 18, 19

Ibis, of Callimachus, 164

Ibycus, 216, 220, 226 sq.

Idomeneus of Crete, 50 (critic)

Ilgen, 109

Iliad, 3-4, 18 sq.; Appendix, 255 sq.

Inconsistencies (in Iliad), 83

Indices; *vid.* Concordances

Infancy of races and individuals compared, 4

Interpolations, when admissible, 64

Ion (of Chios), 211, 213

Ionian Bards, 16

Ionic Epos, 18

LEX

Ionic poetry (not Epic), 70

Irus, 78

Isocrates, 211, 225, 237, 242

JACOB, A., 45

Josephus, 132

KAIBEL, 215

Kammer, 61

Kayser, 59

Keil and Merkel's *Apollonius*, 167

Κεράνιον, 37

Kerkidas, 217

Κήυκος γάμος, 130

Kimmerians, 94

Kinæthon, 103, 130

Kinkel, 104, 131, 136

Kirchhoff, 27, 56, 59, 60, 61, 63 sqq.

72, 93, 94, 130, 215

Κιθαρίσις and κιθαρωδική, 186

Κλέα ἀνδρῶν, 16

Klotz, 111

Knight, Payne, 52, 54

Köchly, 51, 136

Kock, 200

Kreophylus of Samos, 28

Krüger, 212, 231

Kyme in Asia Minor, 112

Kynæthos, 146

LACHMANN, 36, 49, 51, 54, 56, 57, 83, 111

Lang, Mr., 44, 45

Larissa, 11

La Roche, 41, 43

Lascaris, Const., 119

Lascaris, Janus, 4, 167

Lasus of Hermioe, 233, 234

Leaf's Iliad, 43, 45

Le Gras, Jacques, 137

Lehmann, 129

Lehrs, C., 38, 41, 51, 123

Lehrs, F. S. (ed. Hesiod), 131, 136, 167

Lelantine War, 114, 117-8, 174

Leleges, 11

Leogoras' *Diple*, 37

Leonicius Cretensis, 109

Leonidas (on Tyrtæus), 180

Lesbos, 201

Lesches, 67, 74, 103, 106, 134

Lewis, Sir G., 111

Lexica, Homeric, 43; cf. also concordances

LIN

- Linus-song, 4, 14, 18, 19, 20; specimens of, 20
 Lions, in the Odyssey, 79
Little Iliad, of Lesches, 103
 Livius Andronicus, 44
 Lobo (Argive), 224
 Logographers, 32
 Longinus, 128, 204, 250
 Loukanis (trans. Homer), 45
 Lucian, 200
 Lucillus Tarræus, 167
 Lucretius, 139, 142, 143
 Ludwig, on Aristarchus, 38-9, 41
 Luther, Martin, 89
 Lycomidæ, 14
 Lycophron (poet), 170
 Lycurgus (orator), 33
 Lycurgus (Spartan legislator), 15, 24, 26
 Lycus (prophet), 15
 Lygdamis, 162
 Lyric poetry, earliest form of Greek poetry, 4; handmaid of the drama, 6, 173 sq., 198 sq., cf. with modern, 202-3, 229 sq.
 Lysander, 163

MACPHERSON, 45

- Mai, Cardinal, 42
 Mandeville, 144
Maneros, 14
 Manilius, 133
 Marcian MS. of *Iliad* at Venice, 37, 39, 41, 42
Margites, 21, 30, 32, 80, 106
 Mariette, M., 191
 Markscheffel, 129, 131, 136
 Martial, 108
 Massaliotic edition of Homer, 35
 Mattaire, 109
 Matthiæ, 109
 Megacles (Megacleides?), 128
Megara, 168
 Meineke, 217
Μελαμποδία, 130
 Melanchros, 198, 199
 Melanchthon, 109
 Meleager, 19, 85
Meliambics, 217
 Melic poetry, 172, 184 sq.
 Melissa, 140
 Menander, 100
 Mercenaries, Greek, 27, 177
 Merivale, Dean, 45
 Merkel, 167
 Merry (ed. Odyssey), 43

NUX

- Metrodorus of Lampsacus, 33
 Mezger, 240, 241, 249
 Midas of Phrygia, 74; epitaph on, cited, 156
 Midas, 25
 Milman, 233
Mimiambics, 217
 Mimnermus, 173, 176, 185, 193 sq., 201, 211, 215, 219, 233; fragment cited, 194
 Minas, 111
 Minyans, 11, 104
 Mommsen, Th., 115
 Mommsen (Tycho), 248
 Monro, Mr. D. B., 41, 43, 102
 Moore, A. (trans. Pindar), 250
 Moore, Thomas, 219
 Morice, F. D. (trans. Pindar), 250
 Moschopulos (Manuel), 40, 109, 134
 Moschus, 168
Μούσα, etymology of, 12
 Mullach (*FPG.*), 109, 144
 Müller, Carl (*FHG.*), 24, 98
 Müller, K. O., 128, 180, 213
 Müller, W., 44, 54
 Mure, Colonel, 52, 53, 54, 82, 86, 88, 104, 105, 190, 200
 Musæus, 10, 13, 14, 113, 130, 169, 170
 Muses, three, 12
 Musgrave, 45
 Music, Greek, 183-4
 Myers, Mr. Ernest, 250 (trans. Pindar)
 Myrtilus, 198
 Myrtis, 234, 252

ΝΑΥΠΑΚΤΙΑ ἔπη, 112, 130

- Naxos in Sicily, 96
 Nestor, 9, 18
 Newman, F. W., 45
 Nibelungen Lied, 49, 56
 Nicanor, 39
 Nicolaus (of Damascus), 25, 117
 Niebuhr, 48
 Niese, 5, 21, 28, 85, 92, 95
 Nietzsche, 114, 121, 132, 134
 Nikias (of Kos), a physician, 205
 Nitzsch, 29, 43, 50, 58, 59
 Nomic and strophic form, 240-1
Νόμος, 184
 Nonnus, 135, 169
Nostoi, 102, 103
 Nutzhorn, 28
Νύξ ὁθή, 17

OBE

OBELUS, Aristarchus', 36, 37
 Odysseus' character in Odys-
 sey, 99
 Odyssey, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 sq.; 64
 sq.; 93, 96 sq.; Appendix, 255 sq.
 Oeagrus, 14
Economics, 121
Οἶμη, οἶμος, 145
 Olen, 14, 15
 Olympus (the *αὐλητικός*), 186
 Olympus, Mt., 78
 Onomacritus, 10, 13, 22, 29, 30, 35
 Oppolzer (astronomer), 174
 Oracular poetry, 15
 Orelli, 212
 Orpheus (Thracian bard), 10, 12, 13,
 14, 130
 Orpheus, of Croton, 28
 Orphic poems, 10
 Orphic rites, 10, 30
 Osann, 181
 Ovid, 215, 216

PÆAN, 184

Paley, Mr. F. A., 47, 52, 57,
 58, 60, 136, 162, 250
 Pamphos, 14
 Paneides (*Πανείδου ψῆφος*), 115
 Panyasis, 161
 Papyri, with fragments of Homer, 38,
 42; of Alcman, 191
 Parmenides, 139, 140; (citation from),
 141, 142
 Parnell's *Pandora*, 137
 Parthenius, 215
 Particularism, a feature of Greek
 poetry, 5
 Patroclus, 85, 87
 Pausanias, 11, 12, 13, 14, 26, 28, 103,
 118, 121, 125, 133, 137, 145, 161,
 170, 188, 224, 225, 234, 252
 Peisander of Cameirus, 161
 Peisistratus 26, 28 (commission on
 Homer), 35, 47, 48, 51, 57, 67, 80
 Pelasgi, 11
 Pelasgic Letters, 11
 Penelope, 94
 Penon, 44
 Percy, Bishop, 71
 Pergamus, School of, 33, 39, 40
 Perierander, 197, 198, 222
 Pericles, 57
 Persius, 217
 Personal poetry, 171 sq., 206 sq.
 Petrie papyri, Homeric fragments in,
 38, 42

PSA

Phaethon, of Euripides, 20
 Phaon, 200
 Phemius, 8
 Phemonoe, 15
 Philammon, 14
 Philetas, 35, 215
 Philo, 197
 Philochorus, 24
 Philoctetes, 19
Philommeides (Aphrodite), 17
 Philopoemen, 209
 Philoxenus, 253
 Phoenician letters, 11
 Phokylides, 173, 180, 207, 208
Φορωνίς, 131
 Phrygo-Thracians, 12
 Pieria, 12
 Pierron, M. A., 43
 Pigres (epicus), 106
 Pindar, 6, 16, 31, 80, 119, 137, 172,
 178, 181, 183, 184, 187, 188, 190,
 202, 225, 226, 229, 234 sq., 250
 — citations from, 245 sq.
 Pittacus, 197, 198, 199, 201, 223
 Planudes, 111
 Plato (philosopher), 10, 31-4, 57, 58,
 80, 99, 110, 120, 125, 132, 133,
 139, 140, 143, 162, 211, 214, 225,
 239
 Pleiad, 7
 Plutarch, 12, 23, 28, 33, 108, 113,
 130, 133, 134, 144, 162, 163, 181,
 186, 187, 195, 196, 204, 253
 Poetic, the, of Aristotle, 104-5
 Poetry, developed before prose, 2;
 real poetry originated by the people,
 4, 5; anterior to Homer, 8, 15,
 17
 Pollux, 181, 187
 Polybius, 235
 Polycrates (of Samos), 218, 226
 Polydorus (Spartan king), 189
 Polymnestus of Colophon, 187
 Pope, 44, 45, 144
 Popular songs, ancient, 19
 Porphyry, 23, 39, 40
 Porson, 43, 197
 Pöstion, 200
 Praxilla, 252, 253
 Prendergast, Mr., 44
 Preston's translation of Apollonius,
 168
 Proclus, 102, 134
Προσόδιον, 184
 Protesilaus, 19
 Psalms, 79
Ψαμάτιχος, 27

PSU

Ψυχάρωγία (in Odyssey), 53

Pylius, 9

Pythagoras, 32

Pythagorean Books, 10

QUINTILIAN, 131, 163, 164, 226
Quintus Smyrnæus, 106, 169

RAUCHENSTEIN, 242
Religious poetry, 9 sq.

Reuner, 176

Rhapsodists, school of, 25, 25, 27

Rhianus, 33, 163

Rhodopis, 199

Riedel, 200

Riem, 146

Rivalry among early poets, 8

Rohde, 135, 175, 198, 200

Rose Val., 219, 220

Rumpel, 249

Rutherford, W. G., 111

SACK OF ILIUM, 103

Sakadas of Argos, 181, 187

Sappho, 20, 70, 193, 199 sq., 227,

228; fragment cited, 204

Sayce, Professor, 58, 70, and Appen-
dix *passim*

Schiller, 48

Schlegels, the, 48

Schliemann, Dr., 97

Schneider, O., 111

Schneidewin, 242

Schömann, 59, 91

Schrader, 40

Schrevelius, 43

Seber, 43

Semonides of Amorgos, 70, 76, 110,
115, 127, 131, 132, 173, 179, 208,
216

Seneca, 34

Sengebusch, 23, 24, 25, 31, 33, 38, 41,
50, 61, 93, 94

Separatists, 36, 37, 38, 53 sq.

Sextus Empiricus, 139, 144

Shakespeare, 96, 100, 196

Shield of Hercules, 128

Sicilian Colonies, archæology of, 97

Sicilian *Pastoral*, 5

Simonides (of Ceos), 6, 31, 178, 179,
214, 215, 229, 230 sq., 252; frag-
ments cited, 232

Simplicius, 140, 144

THA

Sittl (History of Greek Literature),
5, 21, 28, 51, 88, 103, 105, 109,
149, 176, 184, 202, 205, 223, 240

Sitzler, 212

Skopadæ of Thessaly, 230

Smith, J. Russell, 109

Smyrna, 74, 95

Socrates, 34

Solon, 22, 26, 28, 29, 173, 176, 185,
194 sq., 209, 211, 215

Solon's elegy on nine ages of man,
cited, 197 sq.

Sommariva, 109

Sophists, 33

Sophocles, 32, 58, 99, 165, 167, 184,
251

Sophron, 217

Spartan State, 181-2, 189

Spencer, Earl (Althorp Library), 109

Spohn, 59

Stark, 220

Stasinus, 67, 102

Statius, 108

Steitz, A., 123, 125, 129

Stephanus (editor), 43, 136, 167

Stesichorus, 5, 6, 16, 31, 110, 121, 128,
129, 172, 202, 203, 204, 224 sq., 229

Stesimbrotus of Thasos, 30

Stigme, 37

Stobæus, 162, 177, 194, 196, 211, 212,
253

Strabo, 11, 13, 32, 117, 127, 131, 177,
187, 194

Συγγραμματα (on Homer), 37

Suidas, 14, 23, 30, 34, 40, 111, 162,
210, 224, 235, 236

Susemihl, 174

Swift, 177

Swinburne, Mr., 13

Symmetry, Fick's theory of, 73

Symonds, Mr., 113, 141, 144, 215,
233

Syracuse, date of foundation of, 96

Syriac palimpsest of Homer, 42

TABULA ILIACA, 42

Tarentum, 222

Telegonia, 102, 103

Telesilla, 252

Telestes (lyricus), 254

Tennyson, Lord, 45

Teos, inscriptions of, 29

Terpander, 132, 184, 186, 187, 188,
198, 201

Thales, 209, 223

Thaletas, 24, 25, 187, 188

THA

- Thamyris, 8, 9, 14, 15
 Theagenes (of Rhegium), 22, 25, 30, 80
 Theagenes (of Megara), 210
 Themistocles, 252
 Theocritus, 5, 7, 15, 135, 168, 205, 224
 Theognis, 115, 118, 120, 132, 162, 173, 185, 198, 206, 207, 209 sq., 215, 216
 Theogonies, 9, 16
Theogony, Hesiod's, 13, 17, 117, 125 sq.
 Theon, 167
 Theophrastus, 236
 Theopompus, 181, 189
 Thessalian school of poetry, 73
 Thiersch, 123
 Thracian school of minstrels, 12, 56
 Thracians, 11, 12, 13
Threnos, 20, 21, 184, 246
 Thucydides, 32, 80, 97, 121, 123, 161, 214
 Timocreon of Rhodes, 252, 254; citation from, 253
 Timon the Sillograph, 33, 208
 Timotheus, 213, 253
 Tisias (Stesichorus), 224
 Tollius, 40
 Translations of Homer, 44, 45
 Trees, in *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, 92
 Tremenheere, 250
 Trench, Archbishop, 113
 Trendelenburg, 40
 Trincavelli, 136
Tritogeneia (Athena), 17
 Tryphiodorus, 169
 Twisten, A., 123
 Tydeus, 19
 Tyrtæus, 173, 176, 177, 178, 180-182, 185, 187, 189, 211, 215
 Tzetzes, 40, 121, 134, 135, 137, 169

UNITY question, of *Iliad*, 51; of *Odyssey*, 61; 82 sq.

ἑπομνήματα, 37, 40

Uschner, 137

VALLA, 44, 137
 Van Manders, 44

ZOP

- Varro (Atacinus), 164
 Vergil, 46, 136, 164, 166, 190
 Vico, 46
 Villoison, 40, 41, 43, 46
 Volquardsen, 195
 Voltaire, 46
 Von Humboldt, W., 48
 Von Leutsch, 239
 Vosmaer, 45
 Voss, 45, 137

WACHSMUTH, C., 41
 Welcker, 101, 104, 105, 110, 136, 200, 212
 Weilauer, 167
 West, Gilbert, 250
 Westphal's *Griechische Musik*, 183, 239, 240, 242
 Wheelwright, Mr., 250
 Wiedemann, 27
 Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, 182, 185, 189, 191, 238
 Woermann, K., 42
 Wolf, F. A., 26, 43, 46 sq., 109, 136
 Wood, 46
Works and Days of Hesiod, 114 sq.
 Worsley (trans. *Odyssey*), 45
 Wright (trans. *Odyssey*), 45
 Writing, early specimens of, 27

XANTHUS (Poet), 224
 Xenon (Separatist), 36
 Xenophanes, 6, 32, 34, 125, 132, 138, 140, 141, 162, 173, 207, 208, 209
 Xenophanes' fragment on a feast cited, 208 sq.
 Xenophon, 29, 125, 133, 165, 211

ZAMAGNA, 137
 Zarichus (brother of Sappho), 199
 Zeller, 144
 Zeno (the Stoic), 133, (the Eleatic), 140
 Zenodotus, 33, 35 sq.
 Ziegler, 205, 212
 Zoëga, 46
 Zoilus ('Scourge of Homer'), 34
 Zopyrus of Heraclea, 29



5-

11831

SOUTHERN REGIONAL REPAIR FACILITY



A 000 671 622 9

